



THE
A. H. U. COLQUHOUN
LIBRARY
OF CANADIAN HISTORY

dupd.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Proceedings
(ADDRESSES)

DELIVERED BEFORE

The Canadian Club
of Toronto

SEASON OF 1914-1915

Edited by the Literary Correspondent



313886 / 27.2.35

TORONTO ;
WARWICK BRO'S & RUTTER, LIMITED
1915



F
5547
T6C33
1914/15

CONTENTS.

	Page
Officers of the Canadian Club of Toronto, 1914-15 and 1915-16	v
Past Presidents of the Canadian Club of Toronto, 1897-1915..	vi
Constitution of the Canadian Club	vii
 The British Navy: BY MR. H. B. AMES, M.P.....	 1
The Financial Measures Adopted by Great Britain to Meet the Crisis Incident to the War: BY MR. J. W. FLAVELLE....	 2
The Effect of the War on Canadian Trade: BY DR. ADAM SHORTT, M.A.	 16
Why Germany is at War: BY PROFESSOR G. M. WRONG, M.A..	27
Sanitation in War: BY DR. JOHN A. AMYOT	34
The German Colonies in South Africa: BY SIR HARRY HAMIL- TON JOHNSTON, G.C.M.G.....	 44
Lessons for Canada from the Railway Experience of United States: BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM Z. RIPLEY, PH.D.....	 52
The Development of German Policy through the Nineteenth Century: BY PROFESSOR J. L. MORISON	 61
The Deeper Causes of the War: BY DR. STEPHEN S. WISE....	70
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR ROBERT LAIRD BORDEN, P.C., K.C.M.G.	 81
The Ideals of Trade Unionism and the Attitude of Trade Union- ism on the War: BY MR. JAMES M. LYNCH	 91
War—The Neglected Factor in Canadian Problems for a Hun- dred Years: BY LIEUTENANT-COLONEL WILLIAM WOOD....	 102
Russia and the War: BY PROFESSOR SAMUEL N. HARPER.....	129
German Behaviour in Northern France and Belgium: BY DR. L. E. BROWN-LANDONE	 140
The United States and the Present War: BY MR. ALEXANDER DANA NOYES	 155
The French Revolution and Modern Europe: BY MR. CECIL CHESTERTON	 166
The Near East as a Factor in the European War: BY PROFESSOR ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH.D.	 174

	Page.
The Monroe Doctrine: BY THE HONOURABLE WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT	184
Are the Tropics Unhealthy for Germans?: BY DR. J. L. TODD..	195
The War, as seen from the Far East: BY PROFESSOR A. P. COLE- MAN, M.A., F.R.S.	207
The Gospel of Force: BY MR. R. C. SMITH, K.C.	215
The Reconstruction of Belgium After the War: BY DR. CHARLES SAROLEA, K.O.L.	226
Traits of the Russian People: BY HON. CURTIS GUILD.....	234
The War and the Bible: BY PROFESSOR JOHN MACNAUGHTON..	250
Bismarck's Policies: BY DR. R. A. FALCONER	261
Report of the Honorary Secretary	269
Report of the Honorary Treasurer	272
Annual Financial Statement	274
List of Members, 1914-15	277

Officers and Executive Committee For 1914-1915

President
LESSLIE WILSON

1st Vice-President
G. H. LOCKE

2nd Vice-President
E. J. KYLIE

Hon. Secretary
E. PERCIVAL BROWN

Hon. Treasurer
R. R. LOCKHART

Literary Correspondent
F. D. L. SMITH

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer
H. D. SCULLY

Committee

J. J. GIBSON
A. C. SNIVELY
MAIN JOHNSON

W. B. ROADHOUSE
DR. G. E. WILSON
JOHN M. IMRIE

C. V. HARDING
A. M. IVEY
J. R. BONE

Officers and Executive Committee For 1915-1916

President
F. H. DEACON

1st Vice-President
THOMAS GIBSON

2nd Vice-President
MAIN JOHNSON

Hon. Secretary
E. PERCIVAL BROWN

Hon. Treasurer
R. R. LOCKHART

Literary Correspondent
D. B. GILLIES

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer
H. D. SCULLY

Committee

M. W. WALLACE
JOHN A. NORTHWAY
H. F. GOODERHAM

T. F. MONYPENNY
A. A. BEEMER
T. P. GRUBBE

R. W. EATON
W. J. FRASER
LESSLIE WILSON

Past Presidents
of
The Canadian Club of Toronto

Founded 1897

JOHN A. COOPER.....	1897-98
W. SANFORD EVANS	1898-99
GEORGE WILKIE	1899-00
W. E. RUNDLE.. ..	1900-01
S. CASEY WOOD.....	1901-02
D. BRUCE MACDONALD	1902-03
W. R. P. PARKER.....	1903-04
GEORGE A. HOWELL.....	1904-05
E. R. PEACOCK.....	1905-06
MARK H. IRISH	1906-07
JOHN TURNBULL	1907-08
R. HOME SMITH.....	1908-09
GEORGE H. D. LEE.....	1909-10
J. F. MACKAY.....	1910-11
K. J. DUNSTAN.....	1911-12
A. H. U. COLQUHOUN.....	1912-13
J. R. BONE	1913-14
LESSLIE WILSON.....	1914-15

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

Canadian Club of Toronto

(Founded 1897.)

1. The Club shall be called the Canadian Club of Toronto.

2. It is the purpose of the Club to foster patriotism by encouraging the study of the institutions, history, arts, literature, and resources of Canada, and by endeavoring to unite Canadians in such work for the welfare and progress of the Dominion as may be desirable and expedient.

3. (a) There shall be two classes of members—active and honorary.

(b) Any man at least eighteen years of age, who is a British subject by birth or naturalization, and who is in sympathy with the objects of the Club, shall be eligible for membership.

(c) Honorary membership may be conferred on such persons as in the opinion of the Club may be entitled to such distinction.

4. Application for membership must be made in writing through two members of the Club in good standing, and the names must be announced at a regular meeting of the Club and voted upon at the next Executive meeting. Two black balls shall exclude.

5. (a) Honorary members shall be exempt from the payment of fees, but shall neither vote nor hold office.

(b) Active members shall pay, in advance, an annual fee of three dollars.

(c) No one shall be a member in good standing until he shall have paid his annual fee, such fee being due and payable on or before November 30th of each year.

(d) Only members in good standing shall be eligible for office or have the right to vote at any meeting of the Club.

(e) Fees of members elected after November 30th shall forthwith become due and payable.

(f) All members whose fees are in arrears shall be so notified by the Treasurer; and if the same are not paid within ten days thereafter, their names shall be struck from the roll.

6. (a) The officers of the Club shall consist of a President, First Vice-President, Second Vice-President, Honorary Secretary, Honorary Treasurer, Literary Correspondent, and several others holding no specific office. These officers, together with the last retiring President, shall constitute the Executive Committee.

(b) The officers shall be elected at the annual meeting of the Club, which shall be held on the last Monday in April, and shall hold office until the next annual meeting, or until their successors are elected.

(c) Nominations shall be made by a nominating committee appointed at a meeting to be held at least one week previous to the annual meeting. Their report shall be received at the annual meeting, and either adopted in its entirety or after amendment, on motion and ballot.

(d) In case of demission of office, whether by death, resignation, or otherwise, the vacancy thereby caused shall be filled by the Executive Committee. The person so elected shall hold office until the next annual meeting.

7. (a) Subject to special action by the Club, the conduct of its affairs shall be vested in the Executive Committee.

(b) The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of the President, and five members shall constitute a quorum.

(c) Where the President is unable or refuses to call a meeting, three members of the Executive may do so by giving the others at least 24 hours' notice in writing.

(d) The Executive Committee shall have power to appoint an Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, who shall be paid such remuneration as shall be fixed by them.

8. The duties of the officers shall be as follows:

(a) The President, when present, shall preside at all meetings, and shall, upon request, inform the Club of the proceedings of the Executive Committee since the last report, receive and read motions, and cause the sense of the meeting to be taken on them, preserve order and direct the proceedings of the meeting in regular course. There shall be no appeal from the ruling of the Chair unless requested by at least five members and carried by two-thirds vote.

(b) In the absence of the President, the senior Vice-President present shall preside and perform the duties of the President and have his privileges.

(c) In the absence of the President and Vice-Presidents, a chairman for the meeting shall be chosen by the open vote of those present.

(d) The Literary Correspondent shall have charge of all correspondence of a literary character, and shall edit any literary matter issued by the Club, and in a general way promote and guard the interests of the Club in the daily and periodical press.

(e) The Honorary Treasurer shall collect and receive all moneys due the Club, issue receipts therefor, and pay all authorized accounts.

(f) The Secretary shall take minutes at all meetings of the Club, as well as those of the Executive Committee. He shall issue notices of meetings and perform those duties usually appertaining to the office.

(g) The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer shall perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the Executive Committee.

9. (a) Meetings held on Mondays, between 1 and 2 p.m., shall be deemed regular meetings, and shall be called at the discretion of the Executive Committee, except during the months of May, June, July, August, September, and October. Special meetings may be held at any time or place at the call of the President or three members of the Executive Committee.

(b) No notice of ordinary meetings shall be necessary, but notice in writing of all annual and special meetings shall be sent to each member of the Club.

(c) Fifty members in good standing present at any meeting of the Club shall constitute a quorum.

10. Two auditors shall be elected by open vote at the meeting provided for in clause 6, and shall embody their report in the Treasurer's annual statement.

11. This Constitution may be amended at the annual meeting, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, by a two-thirds vote of the members present, after one week's notice of such amendment.



THE CANADIAN CLUB OF TORONTO

ADDRESSES 1914-15

(September 14, 1914.)

The British Navy.

BY MR. H. B. AMES, M.P.*

AT a special public meeting of the Canadian Club held in the Convocation Hall of the University of Toronto on the 14th of September, Mr. H. B. Ames, M.P., delivered an illustrated lecture on "The British Navy" for the benefit of the Canadian Patriotic Fund.

Mr. Ames' address took the form of a technical description of the different kinds of war vessels in the British Navy, tracing the evolution of the modern naval fighting machines from the old wooden vessels of the days of Drake and Nelson, to the twentieth century Super-Dreadnoughts, and sea-going Submarines. He also described minutely the armament of the British Navy, and the giant guns which have done such effective work during the past few months.

Mr. Ames' address was illustrated by over two hundred lantern slides, and as his remarks were confined to explanatory comments on each picture shown, they did not lend themselves readily to reproduction as a formal address in this volume.

A collection was taken up among the audience, and a substantial sum was raised for the Toronto Branch of the Canadian Patriotic Fund.

* Mr. H. B. Ames is member of Parliament for St. Antoine division of the City of Montreal. As Honorary Secretary of the Canadian Patriotic Fund he delivered lectures all through Canada, and is responsible in no small degree for the great success which has attended the efforts of those who have raised patriotic funds in various Canadian communities.

(September 21, 1914.)

The Financial Measures Adopted by Great Britain to Meet the Crisis Incident to the War.

BY MR. J. W. FLAVELLE.*

AT a special luncheon of the Canadian Club, held on the 21st September, Mr. J. W. Flavelle said:

Mr. Vice-President and Gentlemen,—Let me give you an illustration of the unpreparedness of Great Britain for the financial difficulties incident to the war.

On the 23rd of July—be good enough to note the date—on the 23rd of July, Sir Felix Schuster, one of London's great bankers, addressing the shareholders at the annual meeting of his bank, after a very interesting discourse concerning gold reserves said in substance as follows: "I believe I am warranted in saying that the Great Powers will see that the nearby Eastern trouble shall provide no occasion for war. And I think I may say to you that you may go home feeling reasonably assured that the bank's business will be carried on during the year under normal circumstances, and that you should expect to have corresponding returns for the business which will be done."

While he yet spoke Austria-Hungary was delivering to Servia the fateful ultimatum which produced such results upon the financial world that inside ten days every stock exchange in the world was closed, all international exchange ceased, the possibility of securing remittances from any other country to Great Britain—particularly to Great Britain under the circumstances—stopped. Each country wakened up to find it had to depend upon its own resources for whatever obligations it might have to meet in the near future. London was the centre of the disturbance. The greatness of its position and the extent of its influence as the banker of the

* Mr. J. W. Flavelle has long been known as one of Toronto's ablest financiers and captains of industry. He was in London during the memorable negotiations which led to the declaration of war, and the first-hand information he possessed of the financial conditions in London at that time made his address particularly timely and interesting.

world and the clearing house of the world was the extent of its embarrassment.

You know that an international currency has been established, expressing itself in bills of exchange, whereby the business of the world internationally is covered. But a mere fragment of the business of the world is done by the payment of actual money. It is covered by a system of credit extraordinarily elastic taking the form of bills of exchange, and in this respect London peculiarly represented the volume of it. Bankers and accepting houses in Great Britain for a consideration—and the consideration is estimated to be a sum of no less than 50,000,000 sterling a year—endorse across bills of exchange their acceptance guaranteeing that the bill will be paid in 10, 20, 30, 60 or 90 days.

You may realize the significance of these acceptances in relation to foreign business when I say that it is estimated that at any time, and I presume at this time, no less a sum than seventy millions sterling of German bills were housed in this way in London. That is to say, London bankers by their system of acceptances became responsible for the payment of seventy millions of German bills, if the Germans themselves did not pay them. It was the volume of this international currency outstanding and how to redeem it that caused the first deep concern and became the cause of the greatest anxiety with the London bankers.

The man on the street early gave evidence that he was getting uncomfortable, and on Friday, the 31st of July, and on Saturday, the 1st of August, if you had been at the Royal Exchange you would have seen a long queue of people reaching out from the Bank of England counters, and constituting a steady stream going into the Bank drawing gold in exchange for notes and in exchange for cheques, the purpose manifestly being to hoard it against the evil days which they feared were upon them. When the Bank closed on Saturday night there was as large a column of people still waiting to exchange their notes and their cheques for gold as there had been when the bank opened in the morning. The bankers met on Saturday evening. They had already been in session during the afternoon. There was a condition of confusion, almost a dazed condition in the magnitude of the crisis so suddenly thrust upon them. On Sunday morning, August 2nd, at one end of the city, there met at Westminster the Cabinet of Great Britain. The decisions which they would reach during the Cabinet meeting would determine the course of history, and upon no body of men in any nation ever rested a more serious and earnest responsibility than that little company who met

in the Prime Minister's house on Downing Street. There were tens of thousands of people in London who knew they were in session, men not often known to pray, who felt unconsciously that the fitting thing for them to do was to pray Almighty God that wisdom and understanding might be given to these men in the decision which they would reach. There were at the other end of the city groups of bankers, some in the Bank of England, some in the private offices of the banks, earnestly discussing what measures could be taken to avert the calamity which they saw ahead unless some provision could be made to meet it. And I may say, gentlemen, that in the decision which might be reached by these groups of men or the influence they might have upon the Treasury Department as to its decision, rested not only the safety of England but the safety of countries the world over. One thing only grew out of the confusion of the Sunday meetings. We must have a breathing spell. They agreed to ask the chancellor of the exchequer to extend the bank holiday over Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday so that they might have an opportunity of pulling themselves together and determining what course could be followed, for they knew from the evidence of what had occurred at the Bank of England on Friday and Saturday that if the banks opened on Tuesday morning it would be impossible for the great joint stock banks throughout the country with their many hundreds of branches to withstand the demands which would be made upon them. They knew, moreover, that this immense body of acceptances which would continue to fall in day by day would well make a demand upon the liquid resources of the accepting houses which they would be unable to meet.

Lloyd George responded promptly. He granted the extension of the holiday for three days. The banks were directed to counsel together and to meet with him when they had any recommendations to make. During these days the men who met the chancellor in committee were struck with one or two personal characteristics. One of the noted ones was the man's self-effacement. He sought for no glory for himself. (Applause.) He sought for no recognition for himself. One of the early evidences of the measures which he had taken of the situation was found by the gentlemen who waited upon him, that Mr. Austen Chamberlain sat by his side. He crossed over to the other side of the House and he said, "I need your assistance." (Applause.) He went to Sir George Paish, the editor of the *Statist*, and said, "Paish, I want you to give up the *Statist*. No, I do not want you to give me two or three hours a day, I want you to give up

your position on the Statist for the time being and come into the Treasury Department and live there with us while we are dealing with these matters." And Sir George Paish gave up his position and came into the Treasury Department. (Applause.) While the bankers were in counsel concerning what measures might be taken the chancellor came in contact with a report which—by a curious coincidence—was presented to the House during the time that the trouble was accumulating. It was a report of a select committee upon what provision could be made by the nation whereby the service of the merchant marine could be secured to the nation in the event of war. With an unerring instinct the chancellor seized the salient points in the report that referred to marine insurance, insurance against war risks; incorporated them into a Bill, had them read in the House of Commons and passed in the House of Lords, and within twenty-four hours after the declaration of war the Government of Great Britain guaranteed to every owner of British ships of London register and certain standard, and every merchant who desired to use these ships from any port in the world to any great port in Great Britain or any port from Great Britain to any other port in the world other than those in the countries which were at war, the security of the Imperial Government against loss from the King's enemies in return for a premium paid which, in the Bill, was declared would not exceed five guineas per cent. as a maximum or one guinea per cent. as a minimum. (Applause.) In explaining the provisions of this Bill the chancellor told the House: "The purpose of this Government is to see that the business of this country goes on. We mean that the ships so necessary to bring food products to this country, to bring supplies for our manufacturing concerns and to take our manufactured products all over the world; we mean that these ships shall sail, and in so far as the King's enemies are concerned we mean that this State shall stand at the back of these ship owners and shippers provided they pay the premium which may be named." Within twenty-four hours after the passing of the Bill you could go to a suite of offices in the Holborn Hotel and you could receive a little slip of paper acknowledging the receipt of so many pounds as premium paid for risk against the King's enemies (naming the ship, naming the amount of it) adding that the Imperial Government became responsible for any loss that might arise. (Applause.) This insurance policy was a stroke of genius!

The bankers waited upon the chancellor and they asked for two things: One, we want a general moratorium. Two,

we want a suspension of the Bank Act which will permit the Bank of England to issue at their discretion either five pound notes or under or five pounds and over with or without gold at the back of them. They advanced as the reason for the need of the general moratorium: "We are confronted with a wholly unexpected situation. We have an immense body—we do not know ourselves how great of outstanding acceptances. We cannot face the responsibility of meeting these without having time to prepare. We have great bodies of deposits subject to call. We want the option to rest with the banks whether they will give them, rather than with the depositors whether they will take them." The reply which came back, after the chancellor had counsel with those with whom he took counsel, was this: "We will grant you the moratorium with certain exceptions, and we will issue currency, not Bank of England in this instance, but we will issue currency of the Government of Great Britain; and the issue will be in one pound notes and in ten shilling notes."

Probably the chancellor was at his best in the presentation of this proposal to the House. Turning to first the one side and then the other he asked: "Did any of you gentlemen happen to see the queue of people last Friday and Saturday at the Bank of England?" And as you read of it in the paper you could feel the air of expectancy in the House as to what the character of the answer would be, and it came in very short form. "Mostly foreigners." (Applause.) And then he turned to the House and said, "Gentlemen, there are resources in this country sufficient for any difficulty of any kind which may be presented arising out of these unhappy conditions. There is a sufficient quantity of gold as the basis for credit if we wisely use and conserve it. I refuse to believe that there is any necessity for considering setting aside specie payment. But, gentlemen, any man who wants a sovereign for his use, let him have it and let him keep it, but not a half sovereign for any man to hoard. Don't play the foreigners' game." (Applause.) He appealed to a very deep instinct of the Britisher, his love as a good sport and his pride in national endeavor and his ringing statement: "Don't play the foreigners' game" had an extraordinary response throughout the country. When Friday morning came and the banks opened all over the Kingdom men who had gold brought it to the banks and put it upon deposit. (Applause.) The whole country settled down with confidence that the men in charge of her financial affairs were equal to the occasion. No man wanted money beyond his immediate requirements;

no man wanted to hoard it. Every man said, "We will play the game."

The joint stock banks, who are the great banks in England in connection with the commercial business of the country, came to the chancellor and said: "Now, see, Mr. Chancellor, you have listened to the powers that be, you have declared a general moratorium. But what have you done? You have tied up our liquid resources. No man need pay us a shilling"—"what are you going to do? What are we going to do when you ask us to carry on the business of the country?" And Lloyd George came back after counselling with his committee and said this: "You fear that you will not be sufficiently liquid to meet the business payments, that is the domestic payments, for the country's requirements. Alright! This is what I will do. The Treasury Department will deposit with the joint stock banks a body of this new Government currency upon their request and upon their covenant a sum equal to one-fifth of their deposits." And by one stroke he established a credit on behalf of the joint stock banks of the country to carry on the domestic business of the country of no less than a sum of two hundred million pounds sterling or a billion of dollars. (Applause.) In doing it he said, "I want the business of the country to go on, and you are receiving this help for the purpose of carrying on the business of this country."

This dealt with the domestic situation. But speedily the street was troubled over what were they to do—as Sir Edmund Walker knows so much better than I do and other bankers who are here—what were they going to do with the pre-moratorium bills. That is to say, if the business of the country were to go on, if grain were to come in, if bacon was to come in, if produce was to pass from all countries or if their merchandise was to go out, they must establish a market again for their exchange. There was no discount market in London. Everybody was afraid to discount a bill. Nobody knew where they were at. What did this resourceful man with his committee do? He went to the Bank of England and said: "You must establish a discount market. Tell the joint stock banks who are refusing to discount new bills because they have such a congestion of old bills to bring these pre-moratorium bills to you and that you will discount them and that you will discount them without recourse, so that the joint stock banks will be absolutely free from liability, and whatever you lose on the transaction the Government of England will pay." (Applause.) The tension had been so tremendous upon the bankers, and the difficulty of estimating the extent of their

ultimate liability upon the pre-moratorium bills was so great that when they learned they could discount these bills without recourse at the Bank of England they were like a lot of school boys let out for a holiday.

As the days went by there came rumors upon the street that some of the banks were not acting well, and it was reported that notwithstanding all that had been done in establishing a discount market and relieving the banks from liability upon pre-moratorium bills they were not buying bills freely. The chancellor in his place on the floor of the House said, reciting the circumstances, "This thing was done for the banks for the sake of the business of this country, and if they fail to carry out their obligations I will name them on the floor of the House." (Applause.) The joint stock banks came back with an ample reply, and said: "Mr. Chancellor, it is all very well for you to say you will name us on the floor of the House but look at the position. Your moratorium expires on the 4th of September. On that day there is an accumulated mass of these bills which have been accepted by the London accepting houses which will be presented to them for payment. Will they be able to pay them? We do not know whether they will or not, and you ask us to buy their bills when that great load is resting upon the market and our bills will come in after these bills and you ask us to do what no sane bankers will do." The chancellor showed the same resource in this that he had done in other matters. He recognized that probably he had been hasty in the statement he made on the floor of the House. This he did, at any rate. He went to the Bank of England and he said: "You send to these accepting banks and say this to them on behalf of the Treasury Department: 'Collect every penny you can from your clients on behalf of these acceptances which you hold and deposit in the Bank of England. Tell them that you will pay these acceptances as they mature due, and that whatever sum their deposits are short of the amount of the acceptances it will be a debt due to the Government of Great Britain to be collected one year after the close of the war.'" (Applause.)

Go, he said, to the joint stock banks and tell them this: Every accepting house is in precisely the same financial position as they were in prior to the war because the Government of Great Britain will stand in the breach in relation to these bills that are maturing due and see that the Bank of England pays them and will hold as a debt due against these accepting houses only a year after the war closes." The effect of this new move was that every reasonable excuse was removed from the joint stock banks, every obstacle was set aside which

interfered with a free discount business and the purchase of bills of exchange. This final act of the chancellor, succeeding the others, which day after day during that remarkable week or ten days' time, placed not only Great Britain but all the world under a debt of obligation to the Treasury Department of Great Britain whereby the finances of Great Britain were reorganized and re-established and through Great Britain the facilities for carrying on the business of the world were reasonably set in motion.

The effect of it has been surprising. I am only sorry a mere layman and man of affairs is stating this case rather than an influential banker like Sir Edmund Walker, but Sir Edmund Walker, I am sure, will bear me out in this: The remarkable effect of it has been that all over the world exchange has loosened up; all over the world trade has commenced to assume more reasonable conditions, and in Great Britain itself a great, wide discount market has been established, rates for money are low and resources are abundant.

Now, my time has gone by.

VOICES: Go on, go on.

I want to speak just for a few moments upon that which greatly concerns us, viz., the position in Canada. Let me preface what I say by this: that I have counselled with none of my friends in what I say. The opinion which I express is the opinion of a business man who has come in contact with certain phenomena and has reached a conclusion governing his own viewpoint. The fact that I happen to be the director of a bank or president of a trust company has nothing whatever to do with what I have to say and has no way influenced me in my judgment in reference to this matter.

A good deal of confusion seems to exist as to the remedies which were used in England being applicable in Canada. And it occurs to me that a good purpose would be served in a company like this if you would realize the difference between the conditions in the two countries. It occurs to me that you might just as soon expect to apply a remedy in Canada similar to the one that is used in England as you would expect that the remedy that you would use for one disease would be applicable to a disease as far removed from it as you could remove two diseases from one another. What is the position in England? Every shilling practically of the national indebtedness is owed by the Crown to the people of Great Britain themselves. That is to say, when Great Britain pays any interest or sinking fund they pay the interest and sinking fund to the people of Great Britain because they own the

Consols, which represents the national indebtedness of Great Britain. The people of Great Britain, however, have deposited in the post office savings banks of Great Britain no less a sum than one hundred and sixty million sterling, eight hundred million dollars, which is available and has been used by the Government. In addition they have deposited in joint stock banks in England alone a sum of one billion sterling, five billions of dollars, available for the commerce of the country. The people of Great Britain own all their railways, all the bonds of their railways. They own all that extraordinary and immense development of business enterprise in factories, in mines, in merchant marine, in shipbuilding establishments; all the vast capital required for all this work belongs to the people of Great Britain themselves. All their mortgage indebtedness upon real estate is supplied by the people of Great Britain. In the same way all their municipal indebtedness. Indeed, every investment of every kind of a domestic character comes out of the pocket of Great Britain on behalf of the people of Great Britain. But more than that, after they have supplied themselves with all the money they need, for all the operations of all their businesses, they have gone to the ends of the earth and have loaned or purchased securities of all nations for no less a sum than three billion three hundred million sterling or sixteen billions five hundred millions of dollars, bringing in six hundred and fifty million to seven hundred and fifty million dollars of revenue every year. (Applause.) This nation confronted with perplexities over night of a world-wide character because of her world-wide relations says: "In purely domestic matters we will declare a general moratorium; it will not apply to debts outside but to among ourselves until we can pull ourselves together and get a readjustment of our affairs." It is a matter not of that significance (snapping his fingers) to the world concerning the moratorium in Great Britain.

Look at our position: Every dollar practically of our national indebtedness, whether it be by Ottawa or our various provinces, is an indebtedness to people outside the country. I am quite aware that my friend Mr. Lucas and his predecessors have been successful in selling a certain amount of annuities in this country but for purposes of a broad statement, practically the entire national indebtedness is due outside of this country and one of the demands upon our resources is the payment of the interest due upon this national debt. Practically our entire railway system, bonds and stock, are owned abroad. No inconsiderable volume of our industrial

enterprises are represented both by bonds and preferred stock held abroad. Our mortgage investments have been possible through the sale of sterling debentures or through the receipt of trust funds sent from various countries abroad. The fact of the matter is the supreme duty officially—and I am greatly indebted to my friend the Treasurer for Ontario being good enough to be here to-day—the supreme purpose of every official body in Canada above all else is to preserve our credit. (Hear, hear and applause.) Great Britain had no credit to preserve. Every country in the world owes her. This country borrows money from every country that will lend it a dollar. (Laughter.) And the obligation that rests upon this country is to preserve that credit, for it is the life blood of this country.

Have you reflected what the balance of trade was against us last year? After we had sold all our produce, after we had given credit for all our bullion exported, every natural product of this country shipped abroad, what was our position? We had to pay three hundred million dollars more than we received. Of the three hundred million dollars one hundred and forty millions of it was interest for debts contracted. How did we pay the three hundred million dollars? We paid it in this way: We received it from the people who came into the country with money in their pockets, hundreds of thousands of immigrants, probably one hundred million to a hundred and twenty-five million. We received a certain amount of money from sundry people who sent remittances through banks and otherwise for investment, an amount hard to determine, and the balance we borrowed.

We want no moratorium, gentlemen, in this country. (Applause.) We want no discussion of moratorium in the Chamber, much less in the newspapers. We want no special session of Legislatures. We want to preserve the credit of this country by every man of us standing up and presenting a face that we can meet every obligation if we only behave ourselves decently. (Applause.) But it is vital to this country—I am not raising the matter for pleasantries—it is vital to this country to preserve your credit. It is the source from which you must draw the money. Must draw it, or we have to face that for which none of us like to stop to consider. What has happened during these weeks? Answering—I was not here and I am speaking from what I saw in the London Press—answering a request of the banks of this country the Finance Minister at Ottawa very wisely determined that he would make our bank bills legal tender, thereby

at one step securing the great body of the resources represented by the deposits of this country without impairment. Because, realize this: You gentlemen, business men who are doing business here are doing business with the deposits of this country, the banks being the trustees between the depositors and you, and if these deposits had been assailed or withdrawn to any considerable extent your bankers would have had to restrict your credit, therefore the Minister wisely said: "If anyone wants deposits pay them out in your bank bills. We will make them in legal tender." Furthermore he said: "If you want assistance in the way of circulation bring your securities to Ottawa and we will issue against them Government notes." That policy in relation to the country is very wise and very sensible. We have had in this country people who in the exercise of their judgment came to the conclusion that they could become wealthy without labor. They thought that the labor which other men expended might be turned into cash on their behalf and so they bought lands, and when they bought lands at \$2,000 or \$5,000 they marked them at 10 or 20 per cent., waiting for the other fellow to come and buy them.

A VOICE: 300%.

Somebody says 300%. All right, whatever the per cent. may be, until we had a steady ascending scale and by the same token this advance took toll out of every man who did business in this country and every consumer who bought a pound of supplies by reason of increase of rents. (Applause.) As this mounted up, sensible men knew that the end had to come; that when the bubble was pricked those who were the last in would be left with it. Every sensible man knew this must be the result. Even those who were engaged in the gamble were in a hurry to get out so that the next man would have the load. (Laughter.) Now, what has happened? They hear that in England they have declared a general moratorium whereby no one has to pay anything for thirty days and they say: That is the thing; let us have a general moratorium and we will not have to pay our indebtedness. (Laughter.) It has not occurred to them that perhaps the credit of the country was involved in their action. Look at the Province of Manitoba. If it were not for the seriousness in its possibilities it would be so ludicrous that you could hardly conceive of men who called themselves representatives of a Legislature doing what they have done. What have they done? They have said in Manitoba every debt due upon a mortgage, capital debt due upon mortgage, cannot be col-

lected; not for a period of six months. Interest that is due cannot be collected against the land; it may be collected against any other assets. They do not say, as will the Province of Ontario, that the courts will review each case and pass upon each so that in the case of legitimate hardship they may offer some remedy, but they direct this: everybody who owes any money on land will not have to pay a penny for six months. Then they turn around and say, "We want to borrow two million dollars for public works, and the Legislature has asked and authorized it." Think of a body of men who claim to be intelligent, the legislature of any country, any province in this country, saying on the one hand, "We repudiate our debt," and on the other hand, "We want you to lend us two million more dollars." (Laughter.) The pity of it all is that the reason for this kind of thing is founded in the selfish desire of men to get rid of the burden which legitimately belongs to them. (Hear, hear.) They do not mean to queer the credit of this country but they are so surcharged with the desire to take care of themselves that they forget everybody else. And it is wrong! What is the position of mortgage indebtedness? You owe eighty-five millions of dollars on debentures, sterling debentures, falling due at the rate of fifteen million dollars a year. The next due date is the 1st of November. The following due date will be the 1st of March. Every Scotch owner of these debentures has learned by letter that the Province of Manitoba means to delay the payment of interest and payment of principal under the provision of a special Act. What will happen the first of November? What is the reasonable thing to happen? The Scotchman will say: I want my money. (Laughter.) And as far as he is concerned he is not running direct against the mortgagor; he deals through the loan company. I do not care for the loan company. I mean I am not considering the matter from the standpoint of any interest whatever except the interest of the credit of Canada and people of Canada. (Hear, hear and applause.) Our duty officially is to conduct ourselves so that our credit is preserved. (Hear, hear.) Our duty privately is to play the game with good courage and bear the burdens of our fellows rather than ask them to bear yours. There has been far too much, I fear—disposition to make the first burden of this trouble rest upon the working people. (Hear, hear.) There are too many working people being dismissed. (Applause.) There are too many young lady typewriters being sent home. (Hear, hear.) A too great disposition to reduce the working staff.

I know sound economy calls for retrenchment but try it in some other quarter first. Let me say this, gentlemen: This trouble through which we are going is not a war trouble. This is a readjustment of the affairs of Canada that was inevitable with or without any war. (Applause.) And in the readjustment that is taking place let us play the part of men. If we have been foolish and entered into engagements that we cannot meet, let us take our punishment, no matter how bitter it is, and let us start over again—as many men must start over again—to learn that honest labor is the only basis that they have any right to expect success. (Applause.) We need all our resources to take care of one another, whether with or without war, we have a great body of people in the cities and in the big towns who are idle, who will need help. Let us be careful, as manufacturers, that we do not add to the list unduly by dismissing people who have been with us for many years. Moreover, let us bear in mind this trouble is not occasioned by our banks. A great number of us seem to have the impression that the only reason that we are unable to borrow all the money we need is because the banks are unreasonable and won't lend it. If I have left any impression upon your mind at all as to our position as a borrowing community as against Great Britain a lending community, I must have left upon your mind this view: That after all the amount of resources which we have liquid in this country are comparatively limited. What do our friends the bankers have to do? They are trustees to hold these liquid resources available for the need of this country, distributing them as best they may over the largest surface possible to accomplish the best result. Are they always wise? Not at all; they are not always wise any more than you and I are always wise. But this much I would like to say—and I have seen both sides for I am a borrower as well as having an opportunity of seeing other men's borrowings—let me say that in the discharge of our mutual obligations in this country not the least excellent part is borne by the bankers of this country. There are frequently contentions between them that are not worthy of their great position—jealousies, narrow and small (if they will forgive me for saying so) contemptible—but in all practical relationships between the activities of this country, with the limited resources which we have at our hand, the error, if any error, has been made by our banks, has been they have overloaned rather than underloaned. They have gone to the very edge of safety for the purpose of giving to the merchants and manufacturers the benefit of the resources

of the country, and this is no time to scold them. This is no time to romance about all sorts of measures promulgated by amateurs who think if they were in the saddle they would be able to meet the requirements of this country. If there is any need at any later time for modification of the Bank Act let it come up in the natural and proper way. Let us, as business men confronted with the problems associated with this country, face them with good courage, and with good purpose.

(October 5, 1914.)

The Effect of the War on Canadian Trade

BY DR. ADAM SHORTT, M.A.*

AT a special meeting of the Canadian Club, held on the 5th October, Dr. Adam Shortt said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club of Toronto,—I feel highly flattered, indeed, at being invited to return to Toronto and address another meeting of the Canadian Club. The subject on which I wish to speak to-day, the effect of the war on the Canadian economic situation, is one which might be dealt with from many points of view. It might be taken up somewhat in detail statistically, and trade by trade. But I prefer, in the limited time at my disposal, to deal chiefly with some of the underlying conditions that affect this great question. And in doing so, I wish to endeavor to analyze some of the features which seem to me to require very careful consideration on the part of Canadians, both as to the method of dealing with the problem or crisis that immediately confronts us, and the conditions necessary to the resumption of the forward movement when this terrible cloud has passed away.

I think it may be said without any question or controversy that the outbreak of war has resulted in all the devastation that was anticipated. It has been demonstrated, at many times and on many occasions pointed out by business men and students of affairs, that the world had been growing more and more into an interrelated mass of interests, where they are all knit together in such a way that it is no longer possible for any power, even of second or third rate quality, to stand aloof and pursue the even tenor of its way if any other powers are involved in a great conflict.

Take a couple of examples, outside of the countries immediately involved. Look at the effect of this war on the United States and on Switzerland. The United States has

* Dr. Adam Shortt is Chairman of the Civil Service Commission at Ottawa, and has long been known as one of Canada's most eminent economists, having formerly occupied the Chair of Political Economy at Queen's University.

not had occasion to raise any fund or to collect any army, even for defensive purposes. Switzerland had, of course, to mobilize her small army to protect herself as neutral territory. The United States has been injured by the decline of securities, and by the effect upon the disposal of the manufactured goods of the United States and upon the importation of indispensable raw materials for her manufactures from the countries involved in the war, from Britain, Germany, Austria, and to some extent Russia, whose trade is shut off on the Baltic. The fact that neutral ships, such as Norwegian and Danish, still have the right of trading mitigates that to some extent. If the war is prolonged, unless Germany is phenomenally successful, she will not be able to carry on her trade, get supplies abroad, and bring goods home.

Financially the United States has suffered enormously, because, although I see in an estimate which is pretty correct apparently, that she has about twelve times as many securities owned in her own country as abroad, yet it is the twelfth part which will certainly return home if they try to maintain prices there, which will demoralize the general financial conditions. That is the way in which even a country with immense natural resources like the United States suffers, though less dependent than any other of the nations of the world.

Taking the other example, of Switzerland, a country influenced not quite in the same way as the United States, but which has invested hundreds of millions in electric railways, and hotels catering to the tourist traffic, and bringing in through recent years one of the finest revenues, nationally and individually of any country. You find that country to-day blasted because of the war and of the conditions likely to follow, which are going to destroy the tourist traffic. Thus Switzerland, without lifting a finger, is required to suffer enormously, because certain militarist people have insisted on showing what they can do!

Now, I am a great peace advocate, a great believer in peace; but I cannot understand some of my fellow peace advocates in their desire to have this war shortened before it is definitely determined what is to be the future of the world on this question of armaments and militarism. (Applause.) I don't want to go on into that further than to say that when it comes to the case of Canada, in considering what her future may be one must ask: How is she to expand and develop, if there is to be no guarantee of her future against the increase of a purely militarist influence, ignorant of conditions of political, economic and social structure. A dominant military governing body is a highly specialized class, look-

ing clearly and naturally to its own professional interests. A military organization is an excellent servant for a nation but a very dangerous master. I believe in Disraeli's proposition, that England should keep a highly trained, small military organization, which would take in hand and arm the general body of the people, if any necessity arose, but which never should have any considerable influence on the politics of the country. (Hear, hear.)

Now, if we have to face a dominant militarist future, what I have to say to Canadians is this: Keep as near to the ground as you can; that is, don't expand into foreign trade and get out of bounds, because the reaction will be correspondingly terrible, and if you get too much foreign capital the obligations on the loans will necessarily cripple and destroy your country. Even already, I fear, by negotiating loan after loan our credit may be very seriously influenced at the present time.

Considering the present condition of Canada, let me first draw your attention to the fact that the present situation is not altogether due to the outbreak of the war. In other words, I wish to distinguish between the conditions in Canada just before the war and after war was declared. You who have traveled up and down this country or who have kept track of events must have been convinced by hundreds of obvious warnings, that we were overdoing speculative investment. We were building up great cities, equipping them splendidly, with pavements, sewerage systems, electric light and every civic convenience. The demand for manufactured goods for these cities of the West chiefly stimulated the factories of the East. Instead of putting the thousands of immigrants who have been coming to the country upon the lands to cultivate them, they have been allowed to stay in the cities, and dig sewers or become amateur bricklayers, carpenters, or hod carriers. Under the most solemn promises to the trades unions these people were brought to the country to go on the land. But in the cities they get much higher wages than any farmer could afford to pay them. I have seen the most fertile sections of Canada growing nothing but weeds and real estate stakes. (Laughter.) In Vancouver, for example, during the boom two-thirds of the food supply was brought from outside of Canada altogether! Farmers, indeed, would have been crazy to attempt to hire men at the rates they could get in the cities, wages of \$3.00 a day for the poorest unskilled labor and upwards to unknown heights. They could not grow and sell vegetables on that basis. It could not run long thus, but that was the condition of things,

mostly as a direct result of our borrowings abroad. We had made immense investments, which were not going to produce immediate returns to the country. In consequence a vast amount of invested capital must continue to be idle or nearly so till the productive output of the country catches up. (Hear, hear.)

This is a situation which comes back on us very hardly. There is no use blinking it, and above all, there is no use in charging it up to the war, because we were on that back track very considerably before the war broke out. Therefore when I speak later of remedies for the conditions caused by the war, I don't do so as a means of entirely meeting that more or less unbalanced development which we made before the war. I have nothing to say against the way in which these cities were built, or against a good deal of the development that has taken place, but what I do say—and what I have said to Canadian Clubs in the West—for I don't believe in saying behind a person's back what I would not say to his face—What are you going to do with these cities when you get them built? Of course you know the Western way of meeting a remark like that: "Oh, well, if you begin looking at it that way, you might as well go back East! You have to feel the spirit of the movement: that will carry you along!" And of course it did! (Laughter.)

I have read of certain very clever Hindu jugglers, who are reputed to have a way of sitting down in an open square amidst a circle of bystanders. Taking a little plant from a pot they set it in the ground, and by some form of hypnotism the onlookers see the plant rapidly grow and grow above their heads and the house tops. Presently the juggler produces a little monkey which climbs up the plant, and when it gets to the top it pulls the whole plant up after it and everything vanishes! (Laughter.) Now that is a wonderful gift, of course. But in none of my researches on these subjects have I been able to discover that the juggler was clever enough to sell the plant to the bystanders before it had vanished. Yet that is what many of our speculators have been able to do! (Laughter.) Many of you have doubtless been taken out in an automobile to the suburbs of some of our western cities and have had the real estate agent explain to you their possibilities, passing swiftly in his argument into certainties. You see nothing to start with but bare prairie, but under his hypnotic eloquence you perceive, millions in value growing up before your eyes. You are then given a chance to get in early. That is the juggler *plus* the capacity to sell his vision to someone else. Our Single Tax friends

say that the community gives the real estate its value; but they can't have listened to these agents or observed the practical effects of their persuasive tongues. And their victims are so greedy that they sell, and resell, and sell again, and the last man to whom they sell is the man ultimately sold. (Laughter.)

This brings me to another point, namely, what is the real nature of wealth and capital? Many people cannot understand what has happened to all the wealth and capital in the West. There one found millionaires all around one. They were selling land at fancy prices, and getting first payments on it. Everything looked solid and sound. You consulted the assessment lists, and you saw how enormously the millions were increasing. That looked like solid wealth. If you sold your land for cash you got good bank money, and you can draw on it to this day. There are, however, two aspects of wealth or capital, and these two aspects are interchangeable so long as you can persuade people to freely give the one for the other. These are, on the one hand, wealth or actual goods and capital that really produces wealth, and on the other, simply prospective wealth. Now, prospective wealth, though not presently actual, may be realized in course of time. But if it never comes to the point of realization, it vanishes utterly. The whole question is one of the human mind; it is the estimate put upon the thing that gives it value. That is where the peculiar psychological, social factor comes in. You may have two or three hundred or as many thousands of isolated people, who have never seen any prospective values fail, who, for instance, have seen the value of land go up and up without a break. Thus two years ago you could not find a soul in some of our western cities who had lost any money by investing it in land, and if you find that going on for a number of years, you cannot argue against these solemn facts. (Laughter.) Moreover, every time that prospective value has gone on to the next stage it has become the basis for one more step in prospective value. That applies to everything. You float a company, a railroad, a mine, and if the prospectus takes, see what an immense amount of prospective value is produced, as for example in silver mines in Cobalt, or oil wells near Calgary. Some of the silver mines are realizing prospects, as may be the case with some of the oil wells in time. But my point is, that all that prospective wealth, while the development is going on, is simply in the minds of the people. When you have paid over so much a day to the workers, they spend the money for food, clothing and housing. The people who pay it out expect to get it back with

profit when the oil gushes forth. But if the oil does not gush forth, you can't take away from the workers the food and clothing they have purchased with their wages, and the savings from their wages are not affected by the failure of the enterprise on which they were employed, they have gone into the bank, in good solid money while the prospective values for the investors have vanished. It does not matter whether you pay your money for a lot on which nothing has been done, or for a spur line of railroad, electric lighting, mining machinery and apparatus to develop a mine, if your anticipations are not realized the amount of wealth you invest, as far as the investor is concerned, is gone as utterly and hopelessly as the millions that are being thrown away in Europe in the shells and bullets that are being blown into the air and can't be recovered again. But whether prospective wealth is fully realized or vanishes into thin air, the real value or wealth exchanged for it, has the same influence on the markets for labor and goods. The very large amount of capital sent to this country for investment before the war, came to these shores not in the shape of gold,—a mere fragment of it came in that form—but in the shape of goods. The enterprises which were financed by that borrowed money gave employment to our working men. There was also a great demand for raw materials and machinery. But when you analyze the cost of the latter you find it consists of raw materials and wages. The people who were making the goods or building the cities and railroads were earning their money,—and spending it. There were two effects of this great expenditure: One was to curtail the exports of Canada, the food products and raw materials, grain, meat, lumber, etc., inasmuch as these were needed for consumption in the country. The other was to increase our imports through the need of goods which we could not or did not produce in the quantities required. Thus the borrowings in England for investment in Canada had the effect of cutting down our exports and enormously increased our imports, and the balance in extra imports represented the form in which the borrowed capital came to our shores. Now these imported goods have still to be paid for and all we have met is the interest on them, and the interest paid does not diminish by one cent the capital we have obtained. But only if the labor and raw materials for which we have exchanged the imported goods or capital have been well invested shall we be able to return the capital some day with profit to ourselves. If unwisely invested the effect will be to give us such a black eye in the financial circles of Europe

as we have not had for years. This was our situation before the war broke out, and the war has simply rendered it somewhat more serious by shutting down abruptly on our further borrowings to complete enterprises still unfinished. We are thus called upon more or less suddenly to balance our consumption by our production. To do so requires much readjustment for our cities are over-built and our country districts under-developed. That this readjustment was already in process before the war is evident from the following facts. For the month of July this year our imports fell off \$16,000,000, and for the year ending with July, \$123,000,000. In consequence also the revenues of Canada fell off \$3,000,000 in July and \$20,500,000 in the year ending with July. On the other hand our exports increased in July \$8,000,000, and during the year, \$66,250,000. That is in line with what I have been saying. When there comes a reaction after a boom, or even a slowing down, we can't pay out lavishly to carry on enterprises which are not immediately productive: we have neither the money to bring in imports as we did before, nor have we the money to pay for the consumption here in Canada of so much of our own produce; so our imports are cut down, and our exports are increased. This is a spontaneous adjusting of our affairs, and if that goes on we shall get to a stage when we shall not be running our heads any further into debt, but preparing to get out of it. But this readjustment means hard times for many people who prospered on our great borrowings, and they object to being forced to readjust. "Business as usual," they cry "not business on a new basis." Some of these people say, "If it is true that borrowings from Britain are falling so that we can't keep on building railroads and cities and maintaining the labor and industries dependent on these lines of expansion, what is the matter with our own banks? Can't they lend the capital shut off from abroad, especially if backed by the Dominion Treasury and its paper? Has not parliament granted the necessary power to suspend specie payments?" There is nothing then to prevent the banks from advancing moneys, and handing out Dominion notes to the extent of hundreds of millions to take the place of the borrowed money from Britain, and so keep things going, or at least let ourselves down very easily. Observe, however, that if the banks could come to the rescue of the situation, and could maintain production for all the city building, railroad building, and similar expenditures of capital, this would continue the situation produced by our borrowing hundreds of millions in England, and keep our

importation at the enormous difference of three hundred millions or so above our exportation. But do you expect that the people of Britain and the United States, our chief creditors, are going to take Canadian bank notes or even Dominion Treasury notes for that? No, indeed! They want something negotiable in their respective countries, and unless you can furnish it in coin or in bills of exchange drawing against exports there will result a proclamation of our bankruptcy.

It is foolish, therefore, for us to dream of keeping things going in that way. In the face of conditions as they were shaping before the war and much more urgently since it has burst upon us, it is necessary for Canada to increase its production of goods in demand and decrease its expenditure on works largely unproductive for the present or immediate future. But beyond this there is only disaster in store for us if we attempt to pervert the proper functions of our banks or of the Dominion Treasury in its issue of Dominion notes. The fundamental function of the banks is to facilitate exchange, not to create capital. To this end a bank must keep its funds in fluid shape. It can discount short time notes but never invest in mortgages. The monthly bank returns show that the deposits and discounts greatly exceed the paid-up capital and rest fund. The discounts, therefore, must be in condition to meet the deposits. They cannot, therefore, be used to promote those permanent investments for which British capital was being borrowed. To tie up bank funds is to invite a run on the bank which could not be met. Suspension of specie payments, inconvertible paper currency and increasingly inflated prices are the natural sequences. This was experienced in the Southern States during the war. It was said that at the beginning of the war a man took his money to market in his pocket and brought home his goods in a wheelbarrow, but at the close of the war he took his money to market in a wheelbarrow and brought home his goods in his pocket. (Laughter.)

You cannot by manipulation of the banking system create one more mouthful of food. Yet one real function of the banks is to facilitate the movement of the crops. They may enable a man to purchase a large amount of grain in the West, ship it to Winnipeg or Fort William, or on to the seaboard and finally to Britain where it is ultimately paid for through bills of exchange and the customer and the bank are ready to start over again each with a share of the profit and the loan restored to the bank. The Dominion Government again can neither pay its own debts nor furnish capital

to others out of its Dominion notes. The proper function of these notes is to facilitate exchange by furnishing a convenient and reliable currency and a medium of exchange as between the banks themselves. It is nonsense, therefore, to criticize the Government for not handing out indefinite quantities of Dominion notes to assist municipalities in completing their civic enterprises, or to enable the Dominion Government itself to continue extensive public works. Canada has already passed through critical financial periods when her chief banks were wrecked, her municipalities and railroad enterprises on the verge of bankruptcy and her public credit seriously lowered. The consequences followed us for a whole generation. All this nonsense, therefore, that is sometimes talked in the papers threatens the vitals of Canadian credit and sound finance. (Hear, hear and applause.)

To repeat, the war has simply, so far as Canada is concerned, enforced a condition previously existing and which necessitates financial readjustment. Fortunately that is easier for this country as a whole than for most other countries whose trade was more extended and on higher and more specialized lines. Already the war has increased the value of some of our chief products, such as grain and food supplies generally. Had more of the immigrants who came to Canada gone into farming, as promised, there would have been a better proportion between urban and rural population than at present and manufacturing would have been better supported by a prosperous agricultural class than by stranded city builders and those dependent on them. Borrowed capital built the cities and carried them beyond present needs. Now, agriculture and other natural industries must restore the balance. Meantime, markets, whether those left by the war or created by it, chiefly favor the natural lines of Canadian readjustment. High wages in non-agricultural lines must fall, while the profits of agricultural industry must rise; and it were the part of wisdom for the city worker to recognize this in time and begin the process of readjustment before dire want forces the situation.

Again, we have as a nation, to carefully take stock of our national credit, to reorganize it and conserve it. When this war is over, and when an immense amount of the real wealth of the world has been dissipated, and an enormous amount of the prospective wealth of the world has vanished into thin air, when the capital for investment is relatively small and the claims for it very great—we cannot afford to have our country in a state where we cannot command that capital

by reason of the doubtful security which we have to offer. Our railroad system must be placed on a permanent and rational basis for the future.

Our manufacturing should have a rational programme with relation to our natural resources on one hand and natural markets on the other. Our municipalities with their inflated land booms and consequent difficulties as regards civic improvements and methods of finance must be more carefully studied. There are many municipal, industrial, and other enterprises caught in an incomplete condition and with their prospects greatly impaired. To complete them would be in numerous cases mere waste of capital when it could be better employed. Better simply roof them in, and wait till they are needed for either the original or some other purpose when conditions are more favorable.

The question of capturing German trade is a very mixed one. I discussed it with several people in Britain, who were practically interested in such trades. I found those were most skeptical about it who were most naturally in a position to take German trade. They knew the advantages the Germans have in various lines owing to raw material, cheap labor and technical institutions. Many of their products are absolutely indispensable in the production of certain things both at home and abroad. The United States and Great Britain would take years to produce such articles, and by the time they were ready, the Germans would be back making them,—unless you are going to imitate the Germans in destroying all the plants in the country. When this war is through, these factories, mines and chemical works will be there ready to start up again. Granted that the Germans will have less capital and less labor, the capital will gradually come again, and the Germans will have to be a more self-sacrificing people, working for lower wages, even at first for a living merely. Unless therefore you are willing to cut down your wages so as to compete with them, there would be little chance of capturing much of their trade beyond Canada at least, which is the limit of any protective barrier which may be set up. Canada, in virtue of its native resources and home market, has the opportunity of competing with the world in several industries, it can do so in agricultural implements satisfactorily, but there are many other lines in which we cannot hope to do so.

I have tried to show what are the conditions affecting our present situation as they existed before the war. I have indicated the terrible destructiveness of the war in cutting down capital and industry. We will have to revise our bal-

ance of interests therefore. I have urged, first, that in order to even things we must have greater national production; and secondly and most important, we must carefully preserve our credit as it stands in the face of Europe, and be prepared to offer thoroughly sound propositions when the new development comes, that we may be ready to take advantage of it and go forward with it. (Applause.)

(October 14, 1914.)

Why Germany is at War

BY PROFESSOR G. M. WRONG, M.A.*

AT a special meeting of the Canadian Club, held on the 14th October, Professor George M. Wrong said:

Mr. President,—I am rather glad that you have just made a grave remark about being on the side of God in this war, because I had intended opening in a rather solemn vein. I have felt, in going about the country, that the Province of Ontario, like the other Canadian provinces, is beginning to realize the deep gravity of the circumstances with which we are face to face, and I hope the influence of the Canadian Clubs in all parts of Canada will be used to help the people to understand that we are confronted with the most vital problem of our whole civilization. We must try to understand the mind of the German nation. It is a very large order: there are a great many minds in the German nation, and all do not think alike. But we owe it to our adversaries in this war and to ourselves to try to grasp the causes which have brought us face to face with this awful catastrophe.

My friend, Sir John Willison, who is at my side, may remember the story he once told in my hearing, of the Tory child, brought up in the belief that all Whigs were bad. Once the innocent child asked its mother, "Mamma, are Whig children born bad, or do they grow bad after they are born?" The mother said with impressive gravity, "My child, they are born bad, and they grow worse." (Laughter.) Now, I dare say that we are tempted to take this view of the Germans, and certainly there are outrages in this war which fill one with profound indignation at the theory of civilization that can make such things possible. At the same time we have much in common with the German people if not with their rulers. Some pleasant days of my life have been spent in Germany, I have never been in a foreign country in which one became at home and enjoyed companionship with the people so much as in Germany. Therefore it is with profound anguish that one finds one's own nation at war with Germany.

* Professor George M. Wrong has been Head of the Department of History in the University of Toronto for many years, and is one of the best informed students of European history on this continent.

At the outset let us ask, what have been the real achievements of the German people? One hears a great deal about German culture. The London Times is constantly reproaching German writers for their everlasting shouting about "culture." Germany in one thing is unequalled. She has the supreme gift of organization. I fancy she surpasses even our American neighbors in this respect. It has happened to me within the past few months to have been in three capitals in Europe. In London the person to whom one went in the great hotel to make enquiries, who could direct one about everything, was a German. Again in the hotel in Paris, the person who told one anything one needed to know was a German. In Rome, too, the organizing personality was a German. The Germans possess in some supreme degree the capacity for organization.

I wish, however, to add that the Germans are lacking in genius for creation; that the boasted achievements of the Germans are really more in a technical development, which utilizes the ideas of other peoples, than the gift of profound imagination or insight, which would enable the Germans to be creators in respect to civilization. I don't know any great field of human knowledge other than that of music in which the Germans may be said to have done anything impressively creative. We have to look for the great creative conceptions, for our ideas of nature and the universe, to others than the Germans. Newton, Harvey, with his theory of the circulation of the blood, Darwin with his theory of evolution, were not Germans, but English. I think you will find that the gifts that require imagination, the fine insight into the mysteries of the universe, are denied to the German people. What they have done is notable, but German culture has not been creative.

The tragedy of Germany is chiefly in this, that the Germans, I think one may say without unfairness, have added nothing to the political education of mankind. They have helped to educate us in other ways, but there is no great conception in politics for which we are indebted to Germany. The cause is quite clear. The Germans attained unity at a very late period in their history. The attainment of this unity is within my own memory: I was not very old in 1870 and 1871, but I can remember the siege of Paris, and have some vague memory of the founding of the German Empire at Versailles. Germany's national unity is a creation of our own time. All through the Middle Ages, and almost until to-day, the Germans were divided. I need not elaborate this. Many of you have heard me lecture on the theory of the Holy Roman Empire,

and I am sure you remember keenly your sufferings of those days, when I tried to impress upon you that the old Germanic Empire was not a German Empire but a Roman Empire, ruled by a Roman not a German Emperor. I see some modern writers speaking of the German Empire as the "Holy German Empire!" The late Professor Freeman would turn in his grave if he heard of a "Holy German Empire."

That Empire involved a very shadowy union, and never attained any real national life. The result was that political development and political education were checked in Germany. Out of this two things have come, of vital influence, as it seems to me, upon the history of mankind. The first is, Germany has never gone through any profound political revolution. We had our political revolution in England in the 17th century: the King warred with the people, and you know what a struggle it was, how long it lasted; you know how in the course of that struggle England and Scotland were involved in war, that Ireland was drawn into that vortex, and that for many years our nation was torn by the conflict in respect to political education. The results of England's schooling in politics were achieved without embroilment in foreign war. France was not so fortunate in her training. We find that a hundred and fifty years after England had learned her political lesson, France had still to learn it. Then France's terrific revolution, involved practically the whole of Europe, and disorder and uncertainty lasted for nearly a hundred years.

My point is this: the political education of a people involves terrific upheaval. We have our own country and France going through a frightful period of civil war before the value of representative political institutions is really learned. Now Germany has not gone through that struggle. You tell me, Germany has a Parliament, that there are representative institutions in Germany. Well, so there are. But none the less in Germany at this moment there is a despotic ruler, the Kaiser, and a ruling class, in a sense probably even more real than there was in England prior to our revolution, and in France prior to its revolution. Have you ever studied the mode of election to the Prussian Landtag? It is a delightfully constituted body, as many of you know. Let me only mention how the members are elected. In each constituency a list of voters is drawn up in proportion to the taxes they pay; at the top of the list are the rich taxpayers, at the bottom the poorest. Those who make up the first third of the total taxes, those who make up the second third, and those of the remaining third, each forms a class. The three classes choose each

the same number of electors, and these electors choose the member. Three per cent. of the electors may be in the first class, ten in the second, yet the voting power of each class is equal to that of the 80 or 90 per cent. of the electors in the third class. You see the result of this system: there is no real representation of the people. It is almost impossible to elect a Socialist member of the Landtag, though the Socialist voters number millions. Such is the Prussian Landtag.

For the German Parliament, the Reichstag, there prevails a different method. There is practically universal suffrage, the members are elected on a free basis. There is, however, no real control in the Reichstag of the carrying on of government. The Upper Chamber, the Federal Council, is much more important than the popular house. I suppose the Federal Council is the most curious Second Chamber in the world. We are hearing much about Second Chambers in England, and probably we shall hear more—I hope so—about them in Canada some day. (Laughter.) It is not an uninteresting subject. In the Federal Council, Prussia, for instance, has seventeen members, and it makes no difference whether one of those members is present or the whole seventeen; the Prussian representation always votes as seventeen. You can't split the vote for it is cast by the voters—representing the King of Prussia, and even a King can't vote both ways. In this German Second Chamber each State always votes as a certain number, Bavaria six, Prussia seventeen, and so on, and the members are not representative of the people, but of their Sovereign. Yet this unrepresentative body, and not the popular chamber, controls German policy. Clearly there is no real authority in the people. Germany is governed by the ruling class. Who are the persons who govern Germany? Well, there is the Kaiser, the hereditary ruler of the German nation; surrounding him are the high officers of the German Empire, who might be taken to correspond, roughly speaking, in the English system, to the officers of the army and to the landed gentry. These persons have in reality the full resources of the German State at their disposal.

Having asked who these persons are, my next question is, what are they thinking about? The average German statesman is profoundly convinced that Germany is in danger from her neighbors. Whatever Germany has secured of territory in the past from her neighbors has been gained by making war; whatever she hopes for is to be gained in that way; and Germany with such designs is herself afraid that her neighbors are plotting against her. She is in a peculiar position, surrounded by powerful states. Every since the time of Fred-

erick the Great she has been developing her military muscles to become so strong that not one will dare to attack her. It is quite proper to build up the nation's defence. But modern Germany has passed beyond that. She has come to realize another tragic feature of her position, of which I have not spoken; that as a result of her late national union she has failed to get the share in the soil of the earth to which she feels her genius entitles her. The Germans think themselves as capable of colonizing as are the Russians or the English. Their late arrival has handicapped them, and they are determined to remove the handicap.

I must direct the last few minutes of my time to the mention of two men. You have been reading much lately of Treitschke and of Nietzsche. Treitschke was Professor of Modern History in the University of Berlin. When I listened to him in the 'nineties,—he died in 1896,—he was then getting to be an old man. As I remember him, he had a very harsh voice, due to his being almost entirely deaf. He thought and preached that Germany was being checked by England, while England was really weak and should be shattered. But England paid no attention to him. It is an astonishing fact that none of Treitschke's writings had been translated into English before this war. Why? Apparently the English thought that Treitschke's wild talk was that of an eccentric, an academic expression of jealousy. There is nothing finer in the English than the way they take abuse: they—shall I say "we"?—are so conscious of superiority, that nothing can disturb them. (Laughter.) They were not disturbed by what they regarded as an idealist's theory of the German Empire. One smiles at the lack of humor in such a teacher. A phrase he used quite simply was that the happiness of the world depends upon the dominance in the world of the German character. I wonder what you would think if an Englishman or a Canadian were to say such a thing of his own countrymen! He might think it, but he would never say it! (Laughter.) Treitschke's opinion was that his own type must predominate in the world for the happiness of the world. Germany, having been robbed on account of arriving late in history, must redress the balance. Bernhardt's book is simply Treitschke repeated,—seven-tenths of it is based upon Treitschke and the rest upon Nietzsche.

Poor Nietzsche has had hard luck with the newspapers. He was not a typical German at all. On the contrary, he spent a great many years of his life outside of Germany, he delighted in opposing the Germans, he said that Germany had no real culture. The only European nation that had cul-

ture was France. Nietzsche looked facts in the face. He did what Machiavelli did in the 16th century. He saw that the feature which counted in politics was force. The great thing for a nation to do was to become strong. It might do anything to make itself strong. Nietzsche was the philosopher of competence. What is democracy, he asked, but the cult of incompetence. Nietzsche taught that the thing most vital in society is that the capable men should come to the front and sway all the others. His Super-man was just the competent man made by development so strong as to be able to hold sway over others. Nietzsche had not intended to bolster up German designs. But he did say that the strong are a law to themselves and this fitted in with the ideals of the German leaders. Our wishes mould our theories. It is odd to find how a business man—and I speak as one detached from politics—is a protectionist when protection furthers his interests, and on the other hand how he is a pronounced free trader when free trade conduces to his interest! (Laughter.) I appeal to you, is that no true? The German statesman adopted the philosophy of Nietzsche in so far as it furthered their aims. Nietzsche's teaching is often distorted. But pervading it is the idea that competence gives the right to rule. For the German leaders that was enough to make his philosophy true.

Now, I am going to stop here. (Cries of "Go on!") But before I sit down there are one or two things I want to add by way of comment. Here we are face to face with a supreme crisis. Some of us will be going ourselves to this war. We shall have sons and brothers and nephews going. I suppose it is most natural in this crisis that we should regret it, and ask, "Why should this terrible thing have come to our nation?" Let me urge that there be no vain regrets about the outbreak of the war. It is magnificent that humanity—let us press it home upon ourselves—should learn to stand together on broad human interests. War has come. I believe, myself, it was inevitable: I believe that the ambitions of Germany have for twenty years made this struggle a certainty. Amid the horror one thing is clear. The war is showing the solidarity of the nations. The victory for justice will place our humanity on a higher level than it was on before. We must stake in the struggle everything we have, all our resources, our very lives!

My other word is one of exhortation. You know a professor must exhort, or he feels he is not doing his duty. I once heard John Morley deliver a speech in this city, on the occasion of being granted an honorary degree at the University. It was surprising, when one remembered how in his early years he was so antagonistic to theism that he actually

printed the name of God with a small "g," to hear him say: "This afternoon I have just one message for you: this message is, Have faith!" "Believe," he said, "for one thing, that there is a difference between right and wrong; and for the other, that there is a relation between cause and effect." The relation between cause and effect in Germany to-day is shown in this: for cause you have the thought of war as the chief means of making a nation great, for effect you have the grim struggle that menaces us. But the other thing is to be believed, too—that there is a final and indestructible difference between right and wrong. The German leaders, following Nietzsche, do not believe it. We do; and our view shall prevail and be vindicated.

What about the future of Germany? Well, I wish the German people no harm; none of us wishes the German people any harm. But the German people must learn to accept the decrees of history, must learn somehow to put away the ambitions that have brought on us this evil, and to be content to go on and live as good neighbors within their frontiers in Europe. It is not time yet to ask what we shall do to the Kaiser: no doubt the Kaiser is thinking what he will do to us! This, however, we may say, that no nation can be tolerated in the position of a permanent bully. The security of Germany will be undisturbed if she will abandon this rôle. (Applause.)

(October 19, 1914.)

Sanitation in War

By DR. JOHN A. AMYOT.*

AT a special meeting of the Canadian Club, on the 19th October, Dr. Amyot said:

Mr. President; Members of the Canadian Club,—Allow me to thank you for the opportunity you have given me now of addressing you on this particular subject of Sanitation in War.

In the British Army organization, one important branch of the work is that of looking after all that which we know as the Army Medical Services. They have a very special function to perform, that of looking after those that are sick and of trying to stop infection from those who are sick to those that are well, and of attempting, as far as possible, to prevent those around about the army and in connection with it who happen to be sick from transmitting certain kinds of disease to the army, in which we expect every man to be able to go on the fighting line. The sick soldier is an encumbrance. When the soldier starts out, practically, humanitarian views cease, so far as the relation of the officers to that man is concerned. You find the officer and those in charge do their best to try to keep this man in good health, but the soldier after all has to put everything else aside: he is there to fight for the cause, he is ready to give up his life for it. Just as the British Admiralty had to censure those who came to the rescue of the one vessel which had been torpedoed, because they let humanitarian feelings come into play and lead them to go there to help those sinking; but what did they do? They drowned all their own men by doing it! They got into danger, got torpedoed and destroyed. If they had remained away, probably only one-third of the number would have been lost. Great damage was done. To you who take the humanitarian view that was the proper thing to do; it was heroic; but in war every man

* Dr. John A. Amyot is Director of Laboratories in the Provincial Board of Health for Ontario, and Professor of Hygiene in the University of Toronto. He is recognized as one of the leading authorities on Sanitation in Canada. He holds the rank of Captain in the Army Medical Corps, and went to the front with the Base Hospital of the University of Toronto.

must be effective; you have to bring every man possible there. When they get sick, you have to try to get them better, so they can go out on the fighting line again. When they are wounded, you have to do the same thing, for you hope to get them out on the fighting line. When a man is wounded on the fighting line, and the fighting is going on day after day, if his wound is slight he just simply lies there alone in the shade, without help. The history of this war shows that many men were left for three, four or five days, with no one to help them.

Now, I come to speak of a few of the risks a soldier takes, when nothing can be done. The first thing to think of when an army is going into war is the object in view, and everyone has to take his risk. Now, when we have that idea in view, we have an explanation of what is done, and the means of handling the men and the application of sanitation is all done with one object, to bring the men up into the fighting line. You don't want a man sick, because if he is sick that means one or two men to look after him; it means getting him into a wagon, and that wagon is going to be hindering the rest of the army, in its mobility, its means of getting about, in its advance or retreat—no, don't call it retreat—withdrawing. All the idea is to get the men there and keep them there in good health as much as possible.

Now, in the old wars the mortality from disease was terrific; the mortality of those wounded was also terrific. There was a time when if a man got his legs shot off or suffered other serious injury, ninety per cent. of those so wounded died. At the present time, applying Lord Lister's methods, based on old Pasteur's discovery, that horror is reduced. In the ordinary books, when you would read of a man getting wounded, just as regularly you would read of fever coming on, infection took place, the man tumbled about, became unconscious, and died of infection, or of gangrene. The mortality of the men would go up to ninety per cent. Those men would not go back to fight. But the present methods have reduced the mortality immensely, and in the case of injuries to the lower extremities, unless large arteries are torn and hemorrhage sets in so that the man bleeds to death, if we can get men over that stage, at the present time the mortality is as low as five per cent. Most of those men are able to go back into the fight. In the case of wounds in the upper extremities, a man can ordinarily get back. So it is of immense importance, that we are saving suffering and bringing men back into the fight.

Now, as to infectious disease. Men do suffer from all kinds of infectious diseases when they get grouped together. In each community you have to fight them all the time, but as soon as you crowd men together this danger is increased a great deal. We have to realize that the men must start and be kept in as good condition as possible. In order to prevent disease, you must have good men, and one of the first things is to have proper recruiting done, and a proper examination made of the men who are to be soldiers and to go forward. Often we hear of recruits who go up for examination who are turned aside, very much to their sorrow. They complain very bitterly of the army officers, and don't think they should be rejected. All they had, perhaps, was that the arch of the foot was down, the arch was not good, or the toes were a little crooked. But it is humanitarian to refuse such men, and it is material to refuse them so far as the army is concerned. A man with a flat arch can't walk, and soldiers are required sometimes to walk forty miles. Mind you, soldiers are going to be driven to the limit of human endurance. Have you ever gone twenty-four hours without food? You think then you are going to die! But think of going twenty-four hours farther, and walking all that time, too! That is what the soldiers have sometimes to do. If you think you can't walk any more, the sergeant is going to kick you and make you go on again, for twenty-four hours again. That is what war means! To meet that condition, the men are using everything in them, to the last ounce. A man that falls out, that can't stand the pace, becomes a straggler, and then a prisoner. Others have to hold back for him. So they can't let him into the army.

Take another man, with varicose veins: he is going to have pains in his legs, so he can't walk. A man with hernia, rupture, can't be taken, because he can't carry the load. In the exigencies some day he is going to have that sort of man is going to drop down and be sick. Sometimes they can patch him up for special service, but for regular work, unless they have to take men hurriedly he must be rejected. A man like that may be good in civilian work, but not in army work. Only the man with a good heart in him, that can be pumping blood vigorously through his body, can be taken. He has to carry from sixty-five to eighty pounds on his back, besides walking all those miles. If you have ever tried to do that you know the feeling. A soldier has to do it. If he can't do that, he should not be there. So you have to make that examination of the man.

Then we have to see if he shows sign of skin diseases, for the comfort of the rest of the men. First, skin diseases due to insects. Soldiers come back more or less lousy, and we have to try to keep them from that. It is not a laughing matter, as Col. Brock says. Decidedly it is not! That is one of the difficulties we have to meet.

Then we must see that the man has no teeth out, but has good teeth. Some day he will have to eat hard tack, or cold raw turnips, anything at all, even grass or roots. If he has not good teeth in his head he can't do that. A man that has not good teeth suffers from indigestion and stomach troubles. That man can't walk and do good work.

A man that can't see well is useless with a rifle, either to protect himself, or to do harm to the other fellow. If a man can't hear, he also is a clutterer. So in these things we have to see that the man is all right; we have to protect the rest of the men.

Then we have to limit ourselves in choice in the matter of age, with a view to resistance to disease. Men under forty-five are chosen, as those over that age have not the same resistance, and so they have to be rejected. Men are taken at an age superior to that when there is absolute necessity, or for special services. The thing is to get the healthiest men you can get.

Now, having got that healthy man, the Army Medical Service must be prepared to try to protect him from disease. A medical man is put in charge of every unit, whether an infantry batallion, or a cavalry regiment, or an artillery corps, or an Army Service corps, a medical officer is there to watch over the health of the men. He has his assistants. These look after the men every day, keep track of them, and if they find any individual that is sick they go to the medical officer with him. If he is sick they send him to a field hospital. If they find the man has fever, if it is a febrile case, he is probably sick from some infectious disease, or if it is just an ordinary cold, that is transmissible to the men; or if it is sore throat, or inflammation of the nasal cavity, that might lead to pneumonia; this man is isolated. These are picked up twice a day. The medical officer looks over them, sends them to where he can keep them under observation. You may think an ordinary cold does not mean very much, but an ordinary cold is serious among a group of men. You know how you feel yourself with a cold, especially if it is a severe one. Suppose five hundred men have colds, there is not much courage in those men until they are driven to the limit! But this man is not efficient, so you try to prevent colds from

developing. Sometimes measles, scarlet fever, or diphtheria arises from a cold. Measles is an ordinary disease, but it is extremely serious among groups of men. Under the conditions in which soldiers find themselves, their vitality is affected by lack of food, lack of rest, and mental conditions. So the object is to get the man back into camp, to get him well as soon as possible. At one time they just isolated him, but now they adopt means to keep the disease from spreading.

Then when the men are down there, when they come to battle, the Medical Service has another work to perform. In the lines they have their own stretcher bearers and their own sanitary squad, who look around and see that the water supply is of the proper kind. They are under orders from headquarters to see what kind of water is used. The food is looked after, too. If food is thrown around it gets infected from insects, and boot-infected. The sanitary squad must see that the food is kept clean, and that the men drink from the proper kind of water supply. The headquarter's officers look after the ponds or the kind of water to be used.

When they go into action, a whole group of men are taken right out of the ranks to act as stretcher bearers. When a man falls, they render him first aid, if he is bleeding they try to stop it. They put him behind the line, but they do nothing more. Sometimes they cannot even do that. You have seen pictures of these trenches, and you can understand that there are times when you can't go out and take the wounded men back. But where they can be taken, they are taken out behind that line. Then a second group, of ambulance men, St. John Ambulance men or stretcher bearers, take these men up, and carry them back to a dressing station. Each man in the army has a little package of dressing pinned in his tunic, and when he is wounded, if he can put it on himself he does so, or if not his companion does it for him. But if that is not sufficient, he is taken to the dressing station. There they get the men into little groups here and there, and as far away as possible from the firing line, and get them dressed. The ambulance men collect these groups and take them to a little hospital. From five or six of these distribution points they are gathered to one point, and from there are taken up and carried by ambulances to the clearing hospital. Those with certain kind of wounds are left behind, others are moved to the stationary hospital, twenty miles from the lines, and then to the cities, and sent back home.

These are the arrangements to look after the wounded. The general order is given not to treat a man on the field any more than is necessary, but to give only temporary treatment.

There was a time when if a man was shot people would start after the bullet; now, unless a piece of cloth has gone in, or unless it is doing some damage mechanically, they leave the bullet there. The Japanese give the order not to perform any major operations on the field at all; many of the wounds are just temporarily dressed, or not dressed at all till the men were got back to Japan; the idea is to get them back on the line as soon as possible. Their losses, owing to their antiseptic, clean surgery, and by the practice of these methods, were very small.

Now, as to infection, we have other things to guard besides what I have mentioned. When an army goes into the field, it has to get a water supply here, there and everywhere, from springs, streams, lakes, sometimes only a little pond. When men are thirsty they are inclined to drink from any kind of supply. Now in an inhabited district, when it has to be taken from the ground, practically all these open supplies are dangerous. So the Army Medical Service has to see that none of that water is used unless it is purified. Mind you, many times they are purifying water which is already pure, but it is a great deal better to do that than to take risks, so it is better to start right in and take for granted that it is impure. So they have water boiling barrels, screens, filters, and chemicals to disinfect, including our old friend chlorine (laughter), which is very useful and successful. You can supply the men with good drinking water with difficulty, and sometimes you fail, but ordinarily, though it may not be palatable, yet they will not pick up diseases from it.

As to the things they may pick up from water,—well, there is typhoid. There were in the Spanish-American War, at Jacksonville, ten thousand men, and there were 2,600 cases of typhoid. Yet they had only 100 or 150 that died from bullet wounds out of that lot; there's how that cluttered them. It is an extremely serious thing. Typhoid means that the man is put back, needing a whole corps to look after him. Every man down is an encumbrance to the rest, and he is a cripple often for life, and carries back infection. Around Boston and Washington there are inheritances yet which they are not yet able to drive out, from typhoid contracted during the Civil War, and that was a long time ago. You can't tell where you have somebody carrying around typhoid bacteria: a person may be found infectious sometimes two or three weeks before the disease has showed itself. Those who have typhoid and recover from it may be infective, often for six months, or two years, or even twenty-five years after, they may carry the

infectious agent in the intestine. The more people are grouped together, the more danger there is. And an army may suffer from its own men, or from those people who are around it.

Another disease is para-typhoid, which is spread the same way, its infective agent being in the intestine, and it is taken from water.

During the Balkan War Asiatic cholera got into Turkey. When our men go there Asiatic cholera is probably one disease they will have to face. That, like typhoid, brings its man down, but it is far more infectious, because, besides the intestinal discharges, the infection is spread all around, the organisms get into the food, being carried there by flies, and everything around becomes infected. So where Asiatic cholera breaks out the terror is worst. Think of its effect on the morale of the men. That was one great trouble when the Americans tried to build the Panama Canal, as when yellow fever broke out they could not keep the people there. They spent more than \$30,000,000 for sanitary reasons that would never have been spent had it been that people would go down there, but they were panic-stricken. The same thing occurs when Asiatic cholera breaks out. The mortality from typhoid is about 10 per cent., but from Asiatic cholera it is 65 to 85 per cent., and in armies sometimes even higher, for nearly every man who goes down dies from it. That is one of the things from which you have to guard the water supply. It is a disease chiefly through organisms, and from flies getting at food. Then in typhoid, unless special caution is taken with stools from persons afflicted, infection gets into the water supply, as men are liable to walk on it, so you have to watch it all the time. These organisms are exceedingly small.

Besides that, there is dysentery, a tropical disease, bloody diarrhoea, due to the *shiga bacillus*. Fortunately there is not much of it here, but in Europe they have it. That disease lowers a man extremely, and it has a very high mortality. It is spread just as typhoid is.

Then unfortunately, among those diseases which are enemies of armies, and have wiped whole armies out up to this time, there is bubonic plague, the plague in Central Europe. They have been able, by strenuous efforts, to keep it down, but it is a terrific disease. It spreads as typhoid by contact from one to another, by infected food, by water becoming infected, and then when rats are infected by it and suffer from it they go long distances away, and men are infected. These organisms spread through the body of the rat and all the fluids in it, and

fleas jump off the rats and go more and more off and away, and these fleas, biting individuals who are susceptible, produce the disease. So there is that additional danger they run.

Then there is the disease of typhus. Many of you remember the "ship disease," of which immigrants died here in Toronto and all the way to Quebec. That is a disease spread by body lice chiefly. That is the reason we have it as a ship fever, or camp fever, or prison fever, where people are huddled together. How many of our jails are free from lice? So in camps. And how many ships, where people are herded together, are free from it? Where the disease gets in, it is not spread much by contact, but by biting.

Smallpox is another disease, not the kind we have here—we have been fortunate,—but the smallpox of the continent and in armies of the kind they used to have, when 300,000 were killed in London in one year alone,—that is the kind the army has to fight.

You will say, "Are there all these terrors?" If sanitary laws could be carried out among armies, they could be kept in control, but there are difficulties in the way. The diseases are often due to organisms which are present in discharges from patients, and these infective organisms are spread by means of drinking cups, fingers, infected food, flies getting on to food, infection getting into water supplies, and thus being spread in these ways often long distances. The work of the sanitary squad is to prevent this transmission.

In this particular war we are not dealing with armies as they would ordinarily be: they are made up of everybody you can get, and these are rushed into camp and trained as well as possible in a short time, and put on the fighting line. This is a war of every citizen, it is not a soldiers' war this time. You can't hire soldiers, but everybody has to go into it. It may come close enough to us before it is finished: it may be that it will be necessary for everyone in this room to get up and fight. That is the way it is with them in the Old Country, and in Belgium and France. In France, from house after house, father, son, everybody in the house is gone to the war, whole streets are depleted, everyone between twenty and forty years has gone to the front. It may happen, before this thing is done, we might have to do the same. With army organizations such as we have in this war there are difficulties in the way. With trained soldiers you can say, "Do this thing," and it is done; there is not the same difficulty. But now we have to have a whole lot of consideration from one to another, and we must have some means of trying to control the transmission of dis-

eases. Fortunately we have men handling most of these severe diseases. The first one is smallpox. Every soldier, I was going to say, in a civilized army, is vaccinated against smallpox. All our Canadians of the first contingent are, probably to a man, vaccinated against typhoid fever, with the hope that when they come into conditions that they could not avoid or control, vaccination will protect them, as others have been protected. We have done it with that end in view. If bubonic plague brings down any of our men it will have to be resorted to for that also, and so with Asiatic cholera. Not always the whole army has to be vaccinated, but those operating in that direction where there is danger. Fortunately we have something that is extremely effective and useful in the method of vaccination. We have even vaccination against dysentery. So these methods probably will have to be used.

You will say, perhaps, "Why all these precautions? Is it as serious as that?" Well, let me give you some figures with reference to outbreaks, and the difficulties which armies up to the present time have had to face. I will mention a few examples, and these can be easily seen to prove the value of sanitation. For instance, in the French forces in 1809 there were 240,000 men, and at one time as many as 58,000 men were in the hospital, whom they had to consider in any movements they proposed. One-fifth of them, practically, there in the hospitals! You can see what an encumbrance that was. And a great proportion of them died. Among the British, in 1812, of 30,000 men, 11,000 were in hospital, many of those with extremely serious diseases, who afterwards died. At the siege of Saragossa, in 1809, among the Spanish and English, the loss, on the average, was 400 to 500 men a day, not from wounds at all, but from disease. That is what armies have to face! During the Crimean War, in 1854-5, in six months, from October to March, there were 52,000 men in hospital, but only 3,800 of those because of wounds, the rest because of disease; just as fatal as wounds, and much more painfully fatal, too. During the American Civil War, of the northern army 102,000 men were killed or died of wounds, but there were 201,000 who died from disease. In our South African War, there were 12,669 men and non-commissioned officers who died of disease, and 7,000 from wounds. Among the officers there were 712 in the same time died of wounds, and 404 from disease: you see the better conditions under which they were saved them.

Now, things have changed somewhat. During the Russo-Japanese War, following the rigid sanitary precautions which the Japanese took, when it was possible the common soldier

took a special bath before he went into battle, and at its conclusion took another. (Applause.) So if he was wounded, there was less risk of infection. The food they took was prepared for them in little sealed packages, for every man individually, it was not thrown or shoveled to them, but put up in individual parcels. The water they drank was purified, as much as possible,— there are times when you can't do this. They vaccinated the men as much as they could. And then great precautions were taken with wounds. Thus the conditions were reversed, and instead of having a bigger proportion of men killed by disease, or dying from disease, we find the high mortality due to wounds. The thing was practically reversed: only about one-fourth of those who died, died of disease. The Russians did the same thing. We have to give the Russians credit for their organization, and the minimum of loss resulted. The mortality was in the same way about one from disease to four from wounds. And remember, too, that the fighting was carried on, a lot of it, in midwinter. You remember that the battle of Mukden was fought for ten days, and at no time was the temperature warmer than 4 below zero! The men could not lie down, but had to keep moving. Just imagine the limit of human endurance! What a lowering of resistance, and what hardship they went through. Instead of as in other cases, 12,000 dying of disease and 7,000 of wounds, we find it the other way about, say 1,000 men killed by disease, and 4,000 by wounds. The whole thing is reversed, and there is no reason why that should not be reduced even further.

In the war such are the conditions our poor fellows are going to face. That is the condition the sanitarian has to face, and it is a very difficult one. I thank you, gentlemen, for your attention. (Applause.)

(October 27, 1914.)

The German Colonies in South Africa

BY SIR HARRY HAMILTON JOHNSTON, G.C.M.G.*

A T a special meeting of the Club, held on the 27th October, Sir Harry Hamilton Johnston said:

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Canadian Club,—As you see when I stand up, I am a very insignificant person, and I am afraid I have not a very strong voice, so that some sitting at the end of the room may hear me only very imperfectly, which is why I shall try to speak as distinctly as possible, even if it may seem rather affected.

I am, of course, at the present day rather an extinct volcano. (Laughter.) Nearly all my energy has expended itself largely, first of all, in exploring, creating and placing on a substantial footing a considerable part of the Empire in Africa. And the founding of this Empire has led me far afield. For I have had to go to that great Empire of India for soldiers. I have had to visit most of the countries of Europe to assist in deliberations as to frontier delimitations. I have also had to go to the United States in connection with African affairs. I was born in a suburb of London. It may be the tameness of such suburbs which leads not a few of the boys and girls born in their placid tree-girt houses to deeds of "derring do;" and implants a longing to see the equator, the north pole or the south pole, or other scenery quite unlike the uninspiring surroundings of our greatest city.

I began to take great interest in Africa when quite a small boy. My father drew my attention to the deeds of Livingstone, and encouraged me to read Livingstone's works. From these I conceived a great desire to go out to Africa; but being smaller then than I am now (laughter), and not supposed to be very strong in health, my family, much as they indulged me, rather frowned upon projects which would carry me beyond the Mediterranean basin. However, I managed to go out to Africa—north and west and east, and in course of

* Sir Harry Hamilton Johnston, G.C.M.G., of London, England, is one of the great pro-consuls of the British Empire, and has won the highest distinction as administrator of various African Dependencies of the Empire. He is also a recognized authority in the field of Zoology and Geographical Discovery.

time my work as an explorer obtained for me an appointment in the African consular service. Thus I became concerned from the early 'eighties with the first beginning of the German colonies in Africa. My first intimation as to German colonial schemes was rather curious. Traveling with Lord Mayo, son of a great Viceroy of India, in the Kunene country (Southern Angola) belonging to the Portuguese (we were in Boer wagons, hired from Boer pioneers) one day, under the fierce sunshine, our Boer driver in a laconic way pointed out something lying on the desert, which he opined was a white man. And so it was, a German traveler, who had been sent out to make inquiries and conclude treaties with some chiefs. Something had happened to his caravan, he had lost his way, and was dying of thirst. We picked him up, and enabled him to proceed on his way. This was the beginning of the German attempt to get a foothold in Southwest Africa. (Laughter.) A perfectly legitimate aspiration.

Well, down to the 4th of August last I should have made my story take quite a different direction. Even down to the 4th of August I was called at home a pro-German, so much have I been associated with the Germans in Africa, so much have I studied in Germany, so heartily have I appreciated the lasting good in the German nature. But in those days I confess I was rather rampant Imperialist, and regretted extremely the rather halting policy of the Cape Government, which enabled this man's treaties to be made—I have long since forgotten his name,—and the German missionaries and German traders to settle under the German protectorate in Southwest Africa. I mention the German missionaries, for the Germans have as much right to declare a protectorate in that region and to plant colonies, as we have. Their civilization took a very sensible form among the Hottentots and Damaras. Many of the descendants of the first German missionary settlers have drifted into Cape Colony, and are loyal to their British citizenship. Germany has done some good in Southwest Africa, impressing the white man's rule upon the native population of Hottentots and Bantu negroes in that region, who before German intervention were fighting each other to the verge of extermination.

As regards my dealings with them in East Africa:—My first undertaking in Equatorial East Africa was called after the modest fashion of those days, a "scientific expedition." (Laughter.) I had had an apprenticeship in natural science. I had traveled previously with Lord Mayo in Angola and with Stanley on the Congo. I had returned with some know-

ledge of African languages. In East Africa my first journeys were directed to the exploration of Mt. Kilimanjaro. When my scientific work was accomplished I hoisted the British flag here and there (laughter) and made treaties with the African chiefs, helped in this by the great influence of the Sultan of Zanzibar, who had known Livingstone, and was very friendly with Sir John Kirk. I strayed from science into the field of political geography because the Germans, under Dr. Peters, Count Pfeil, and other pioneers, had entered East Africa south of Kilimanjaro, and secured by treaties a large area of country for German exploration. But I was somewhat mortified after my return to find that to please the German Emperor we had surrendered this mighty snow-capped mountain, Kilimanjaro, on which I had founded a station and hoisted a British flag. It is permissible to hope that as one result of this war, which has been absolutely forced on us, Kilimanjaro may pass once more under the British flag. (Hear, hear.)

As regards East Africa in general, though they acquired this Snow Mountain they lost much worth having in East Africa, a region which is divided into healthy and unhealthy districts. More by accident than design, we got the healthy districts, and the Germans the unhealthy. (Laughter.) So that at the present day, without any particular pushing on our part (laughter) there are now eight thousand thoroughly healthy, well-to-do, British settlers going on the unoccupied land of that region; but there are only, I am told, about one thousand Germans in that vast area of German East Africa, which contains something like 385,000 square miles.

My next journey was to the other side of Africa to the Kamerun and the Niger delta. Germany was anxious to get the Niger basin, which had been explored by Germans (mostly in British pay). But France also claimed Nigeria in the west, and in 1884-5 Great Britain has established her claims to control Eastern Nigeria.

When I talk about "colonizing" such parts of tropical Africa, I do not mean that white men take the place of the natives. On the contrary Britain has done all it could to foster the land-holding of the native population. Our reward for keeping the peace has come in the trade, which has increased by leaps and bounds. Since all these regions have come under the British flag, trade is equally open to foreign enterprise. We cannot at least be accused of making a selfish use of our Empire in tropical Africa.

After my return from East Africa, in 1885, the late Lord Salisbury who had read some of my writings on Africa, had appointed me to a double post, that of Vice-Consul in Southern Nigeria and Vice-Consul in the Kamerun.

Here, I am afraid, I became for a time somewhat of a thorn in the side of the Germans; for to use one of their similes, I was as active as a flea, and in their opinion not much larger (laughter) and I hopped about the debatable lands between the Niger and the Cameroons River making treaties and planting flags on unclaimed territory in a way that exasperated the slower moving Germans. (Laughter and applause.) However, I managed at last to come to a friendly understanding with them, and our later relations were really pleasant. I was three years Vice-Consul in the Kamerun; then I was sent to the other side of Africa as a Consul, to try to solve serious problems on Lake Nyasa, where Arab leaders were carrying on a vigorous slave trade, in spite of the remonstrances of a British trading company and several missionary societies; they were, in fact, devastating the whole lakes region to an almost inconceivable degree. Amongst others of the British volunteers who checked their ravages was Sir Frederick Lugard, now Governor-General of Nigeria, a man who has written his name largely in colonial annals. There was some intention on the part of the Germans to send a force across from the sea coast to take possession of the north end of Lake Nyasa, the region between Nyasa and Tanganyika. My second problem therefore was to get into these regions before the Germans. It was also necessary to forestall the Portuguese, because they also were desirous of extending their empire. These three problems I managed to solve. Fortunately, having a knowledge of the Swahili language (then much spoken on the west coast of Lake Nyasa) I was able to discuss the situation with one of the Arab chiefs who had not joined in the rebellious slavers' war against the British because of his reverence for the memory of Livingstone. (Applause.) Another personage whom he held in high esteem was Queen Victoria. (Applause.) I met this Arab, with no arms, and only accompanied by fifteen negro porters. I am afraid I traded a little upon the chief's extreme reverence for Queen Victoria, by allowing him to believe, rather than by suggesting, that I was a distant connection of hers. (Laughter and applause.) His impression arose from the name the porters had given me: *Mwana Kwini*. "Mwana" means "son," and "Kwini" stood for Queen Victoria throughout East Africa, the Queen

being considered to be in some sense the "mother" of the British people. This appellation in those days was often applied to the rare Englishman who traveled in the interior. I told this Arab, therefore, that Queen Victoria wished to see the slave trade put an end to; that if he pleased her in this, she would never forget it, and would write him a letter to say so, and he would be handed down in history as a man who helped to free Africa from the slave trade. This impression induced him to give me four hundred soldiers, and with these I went to the other end of the region to conclude peace. My different expeditions (which included three other Englishmen) came back with treaties which made British Central Africa as we see it to-day. The Germans offered no serious opposition to this project, though Bismarck had sent a telegram asking our government that "Consul Johnston might be stopped at the 11th degree of south latitude." Lord Salisbury's 1890 agreement with Germany settled all these African ambitions, and after that I worked with the Germans as a comrade and friend, and received from them similar help and regard. When some Arabs came one time to crush me, the Germans came to my support, and placed at my disposal the very steamer we captured the other day on Lake Nyasa. Had not the Germans helped me then, I might have had a different story to tell, and perhaps not have been here to tell it.

In Uganda, also, my work was carried on harmoniously with the German officials of the adjoining territory of German East Africa. In later years I have studied much in Germany the sciences connected with Africa, and have striven (as my writings will bear witness) to bring about a good understanding between Germany and Great Britain in matters of colonial expansion. Down to a few weeks before the outbreak of this war, it is believed that Great Britain had come to an understanding with Germany which would have enabled her to extend her possessions or concessions in Southwest Africa, and even in the Congo basin. When this war began, Germany was mistress of 1,100,000 square miles of Africa, and she was turning several of her African possessions to a profitable use. They furnished her trade with and opened new markets for German goods. But somehow or other Germans in the mass held back from colonizing their own territories in German Africa. For until the war, the total of German colonists (in 1,100,000 square miles) was under 24,000; while at that time there were probably 100,000 Germans in the whole of British Africa. (Applause.)

But to do the Germans justice, they maintained the principle of free trade quite as well as we have done in their African possessions; and British traders made a very good second to the German traders in the development of German Africa. (Applause.)

Now to pass to other regions than Africa. The Germans had managed to secure those islands that England might well have taken, in Oceania. They had annexed the northeast portion of New Guinea, which they renamed Kaiser Wilhelm Land. The great Archipelagoes east of New Guinea had been discovered by the great navigator and pioneer Captain Cook, who had called two of the largest islands New Britain and New Ireland. For these names the Germans substituted New Mecklenburg and New Pommern. The largest group of islands was called the Bismarck Archipelago. Germany took advantage of our being in a rather critical position in international affairs to secure from us consent to her annexing the Archipelago of Samoa. This has since the war passed under the British New Zealand flag. (Applause.) The final result, at any rate of these operations, was that Germany obtained nearly 100,000 square miles in New Guinea and in the Pacific islands.

Here, however, she dealt fairly with British commerce. As you know, she also acquired from China on leasehold, Kiao Chau, on the plea of protecting German missionaries. We have no right to sneer, as we acquired Hong Kong for a similar reason, because of attacks on British missionaries and on British shipping. Germany, however, fortified the capital of this region—Tsing Tao—with the design of becoming the dominant power in the China seas.

Finally, to her was conceded by Britain, Russia, and France that important sphere of influence in what remains of Turkey in Europe and Turkey in Asia. Through the good will of Great Britain and the desire to give Germany a place in the sun for the development of trade and for her redundant population, Great Britain took the lead in regard to encouraging the Baghdad Railway, and used her influence with France and Russia to secure for Germany very important concessions in Asia Minor and Mesopotamia: altogether about 400,000 square miles.

In one way or other, by yielding possessions we had already occupied or by withdrawing opposition we have enabled Germany and Austria to dominate not far short of 2,000,000 square miles. It is quite untrue, as some German writers have stated, that Germany got only the waste, neglected and

worthless regions of the world. Look at Southwest Africa: it certainly has a good deal of desert, but that is found to be full of valuable minerals and diamonds. Nor did we yield it cynically believing it worthless, because our own discoverers and geologists had revealed to us, before the German occupation, specimens of its mineral wealth such as cobalt, gold, and diamonds, also phosphate deposits, and coal; in short, Southwest Africa though arid was rich, and the aridity could be dispelled by boring and sinking artesian wells. And I hope that the control of this region will be taken over by us from Germany in the settlement which we shall exact from Germany.

You have read to-day of the struggle in the Kamerun. That is also a valuable region, of some 290,000 square miles, abounding in tin, valuable oils, and rubber on the coast, while cattle- and horse-breeding flourishes in the districts of the interior. Then, again, German East Africa has begun to attack British East Africa before we even decided to go to war ourselves. German East Africa, as I reminded you, is less healthy than British East Africa; but the native population, going on for 8,000,000, is industrious, and will turn out valuable food and vegetable products for the world's use.

Now there can be only one conclusion to this war, so far as German oversea possessions are concerned; they must cease to be German. (Hear, hear, and applause.) I don't say those words in any narrow-minded, dog-in-the-manger spirit, but because we have learned that each one of the German colonies has been made the basis for craftily-planned attacks on the possessions of powers hitherto friendly. (Hear, hear.) Never again can we trust the German spirit in view of this war of ravage. Therefore, though we may leave Germany in Europe as intact, in regard to the regions mainly inhabited by Germans, though we may clip very little off real German territory, we must insist,—and you in Canada must back it up, in case we at home become weak-kneed or sentimental (for there is always an inclination on our part to be influenced by pity), we must insist that none of these great territories beyond the seas shall remain under German political control. (Applause.) And finally, when we have made this change, and this will be perhaps the most difficult pill for you to swallow,—we must likewise insist upon the policy that these territories taken from Germany shall remain as fully open as before to German trade and colonization: it would be going athwart those principles with which the British Empire is inevitably bound up to adopt any other attitude. (Applause.) There is

nothing to be gained for the good future of the world by exterminating or making desperate seventy millions of hard-working people, many of them, I firmly believe, not in sympathy with this war. (Hear, hear.) I maintain there must be some door of repentance kept open for Germany and Austria, and they must once again be allowed to colonize these regions if they wish to develop them, but they must do so under the British and not under the German flag! (Long applause.)

(November 10, 1914.)

Lessons for Canada from the Railway Experience of the United States

BY PROF. WM. Z. RIPLEY, PH.D.*

AT a special luncheon of the Club, held on the 10th Nov., Professor Ripley said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Club,—I wish I might speak to you on the great subject which is so much in all our minds at this time. It is very impressive to come here and see the young men drilling out at the University grounds, and then in Convocation Hall to see the women knitting and knitting, and then not to be able to say anything about the way we feel concerning it. (Applause, and voices, "Go ahead!") If it were not for being neutral, and if it were not for the possible endangering of that position of aloofness from the conflict in which the United States now stands, I should like to tell you how fully the American people (hear, hear, and applause) sympathize with the nations that are fighting for the civilization of the twentieth century against mediævalism. (Hear, hear, and applause.) I can't tell you that, because I must be neutral. (Laughter.)

I should like to go further, and to assure you that in spite of a campaign which is being conducted with an energy which shows that the learned world of Germany is not sure of its position (hear, hear), though that campaign is directed to what is called the learned world in America with an energy and persistence that would surprise you,—there is hardly a day that I do not receive a report or something of one sort or another from my friends in Germany—of course I am telling you what I really ought not to tell you (laughter)—which is an insult to our intelligence. (Hear, hear, and applause.) And if I only could, how glad I should be to go on and develop that subject, in order that whatever moral sympathy and moral support there is in the United States you should feel was yours. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

* Professor Wm. Z. Ripley occupies the chair of Economics in Harvard University. He has specialized on the subject of railway rates and their regulation, and is generally recognized as one of the chief authorities on transportation questions in United States. He enjoys a wide reputation as an author and lecturer.

Again, I regret that I cannot express my own views. (Laughter.)

But, to turn from that, to the subject which has been appointed for this occasion,—we have a very interesting situation in the United States by reason of the extraordinary shift of scene and circumstance within the last seven or eight years. About 1906 it looked as if nothing could stop the forward movement of railroad prosperity and earning power which promised to go on indefinitely. The prices of all sorts of railroad securities were soaring to unprecedented figures. 'All kinds of securities could be marketed freely. The railroads seemed to be clear of financial difficulties. And now, within so short a space of time, beginning in 1910, we find them practically pleading with the Federal Government for the right to increase their rates by what seems like a very small amount, only 5 per cent. The attention of the American people is focussed upon this issue, because now for the third time the matter is coming to the front in official proceedings. It seems almost like a case—as some one put it when writing on the subject—of a “re-irritation of the same subject.” (Laughter.) The last of the three cases in the course of this plea for more generous treatment is now pending. So sharp is the contrast within the last seven or eight years, it seems well worth while to understand the different conditions which present themselves, in particular the conditions which coincidentally confront your Canadian roads. First, there has been a steady increase in the “cost of living,” and a rapid increase, probably more marked with us than with you, in the wages paid to employees. You have had the advantage of what many of us regard as a great piece of constructive legislation, the Canadian Industrial Disputes Act. (Applause.) I have been endeavoring with others to secure the adoption of similar legislation in our own State of Massachusetts. The Federal Government has had such an Act,—a sort of half-way, half-baked measure, which, however, threw the whole responsibility in cases of this sort upon one man, the third member of a threefold board. All the railroads were compelled to assent to increases based upon demands for two loaves where only one was really expected or deserved. The result is that the wage outgo of the railroads has rapidly increased. And now, in addition, it has come, to where it is difficult borrowing money at any rate. That has imposed heavy additional burdens.

On top of all this has come a development which perhaps you may feel here in Canada, but which I am sure you are bound to notice more as the years go by. As your population

grows and your territory fills up, there is a demand from the public and a necessity for a very large number of quite unproductive expenditures,—the abolition of grade crossings, the construction of terminals, safety appliances, which no doubt you now have, all sorts of legislation for train crews, and the like, every one of which adds to the cost of running a road. And then when with us they ask for higher rates, the Government replies that they should manage the roads with greater efficiency. A campaign for efficiency may well be prosecuted to a certain extent; but everyone who has had experience will agree that it is extremely difficult to apply a modern, up-to-date efficiency plan to a plant spread out over some thousands of miles. The situation is well revealed in the story a railroad man is fond of telling, of the way in which a certain road tried to lessen its wastes in management. They preached to the men all along the line not to waste any material and to recover everything that was lost. The road master picked up a couple of spikes lying in the bushes and coming to the track gang, he held them up saying to the foreman, "Somebody has been careless. Here are two spikes you have lost!" "Bejabbers," replied the foreman, "I'm glad you've found them; I had two men out for three days hunting them up." (Laughter.)

There is another feature of our railroad finance which has been pressed home to us very closely, and which perhaps you have not yet felt. But I am quite certain before many years you will note the same tendency. A railroad is a business subject to a law called that of increasing returns, which is to the effect that the more business you do, the greater your profit seems to be. Fifteen years ago, it was believed that all our American railroads, having a bright future before them, might look forward to greater and greater profitableness. But they soon found out, beginning about ten years ago, that there is a sort of cycle in the outgo of railroads. They are like any business where you have a given plant, which you can operate more and more fully to a certain capacity, and secure, up to that capacity, greater profit; because you spread the overhead charges over a greater number of units. But if you pay out every cent you earn, you suddenly discover the necessity of doubling your plant. But sometimes when you double your plant, instead of spreading the outgo more thinly, you have more than doubled your overhead charges to spread over the same outgo. You have reached that limit from a state in which the profits were increasing, to a condition of expensive operation. That is what is the matter with what used to be one of the great railroads of New England,—the Boston &

Maine. It went on paying more dividends than it should for years, not setting aside proper reserves. It was then discovered that heavier bridges could not be added piecemeal nor could it put on heavier rolling stock because of want of bridges, without rebuilding the whole line. You could not in other words develop a railroad beyond a certain point without doing the whole thing over from bottom to top. This called for a reserve of surplus in the treasury or else a reserve of credit which could be drawn upon. There comes a slump in profits. And it is that depression in which a number of railroad properties in the United States are found at the present time.

Our American roads are also suffering from an undue accumulation of mortgage indebtedness. Ten years ago, stocks and bonds were about equal, about 50% of the one to 50% of the other. But with the passage of time the weaker roads borrowed and borrowed; until, over the United States as a whole, the last time I looked it up, mortgage indebtedness was \$11,000 per mile more than the stock capital, and that too as applied to 250,000 miles of line covering the whole of the United States. Individual roads could be found in which 75, yes even 85 per cent. of the capitalization is in bonded indebtedness instead of stocks. Unfortunately this is exactly like the experience of all borrowers. When one begins to borrow, one must keep it up, first on long time bonds, but pretty soon on the pawnbroker basis of loans on short term notes. Presently the accumulation of notes come upon the road suddenly, and there is a crisis. That is the situation in which a number of American roads find themselves at this time; and that is the reason for the panic in which the managers of some of them seem to be.

And then to explain finally the reason of the precariousness of the situation among American roads; we seem to be recovering somewhat from an orgy of speculation and manipulation of securities which did an incalculable amount of harm, in my judgment, between the years 1899 and 1906. It is a great pity that constructive geniuses like Harriman should at times have permitted things which ought never to have been done. It is a pity that a great financial genius like J. P. Morgan should also have done what he did in New England. Who is there among men of genius, one may ask, but has had occasional lapses from virtue? But the result upon the roads altogether, all over the country, is that the American people have been occupied for the last three or four years in undoing a lot of work done originally for no other reason than the immediate advantage of the bankers concerned.

The description in a boy's composition on James II. aptly sets forth the situation at this time. He wrote, "The English people stood a great deal from James II.; but when he gave birth to a son, they said, "This thing must stop!" (Laughter.)

Thus the Federal Government has separated the two parts of the New England system,—as I think unwisely,—but the Federal Government does not, and the Federal Government seems to be ahead at the present time. The Gould system was the first great combination stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This went to pieces by way of bankruptcy. The Rock Island has since followed suit. The trunk lines were tied up as well; but are now to quite a considerable degree set off again. The result is that our transportation is conducted by smaller units, which perhaps may achieve better results than have been obtained in the past few years.

The present situation of the country, then, is this: The high cost of living, more wages, extremely onerous governmental interference in forty-five or fifty different States, each peppering away independently with legislation. The railroads are thus suffering from many things for which they are not to blame except what some banker-managers are distinctly culpable. Unfortunately the collapse of roads like those in New England is so far-reaching in effect, that I can only compare the tragedy to such an event as the possible bankruptcy of the Canadian Pacific Railway in your own territory.

What are we doing constructively? Is there anything which may have significance for you? You are aware, of course, that we have only recently, that is to say in 1906-10, given authority to our Federal Interstate Commerce Commission similar to that which your Railway Commission of Canada has enjoyed for a long time. We have, however, now conferred that authority, and the question is, what shall be done with it. These Commissioners, sitting at Washington, have the right to say yes or no to every application for rates coming before them; and at this time the whole of United States is watching for the exhibition of that far-sighted wisdom which should be exercised in deciding matters of such moment. Their present attitude is a little bit like that of "Mamma," when she said to the nurse, "I wish you would find little Johnnie; I don't know what he is doing, but tell him to stop it at once." (Laughter.) That is to say, it is a negative policy, of denying, of turning down, instead of a policy which shall have a constructive upbuilding influence. Of course, the Federal Governmental Commissioners do not bear the same direct responsibility which is placed upon the

managers of these properties; but, nevertheless, the time seems to have come for a more constructive policy. As bearing upon the question whether the carriers should have more revenue or not, we have just started upon a piece of work which you have not attempted yet in Canada; but which some day may be worth your while, or someone at all events may think it so. The experiment will cost fifteen or twenty million dollars, and will take four or five years to complete. Quite a while ago, different local authorities began to make what are called physical valuations of the properties of their carriers. There was complaint that they were very much over-capitalized, that they had very many more securities outstanding than were represented by their assets; and that they were really earning not a modest 8%, but 16%, or even 25% in dividends. This widespread popular opinion fifteen or twenty years ago was probably justified. But at all events, as one road after another went to the Supreme Court of the United States on questions concerning reasonable rates, it became apparent that this august body itself was not able to decide. It could find no sure footing, no criterion by which to judge whether the carriers were getting a fair return or not.

There is manifestly a relation between the amount of the investment and the sum which a railroad should be allowed to earn. That is evidently the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the other Federal Courts which have followed its lead. The result is that the people have set about making an inventory of this wealth representing, let us say, one-fifth of the possessions of the United States. That is a pretty big job. They are calipering the rails and counting the ties. They will find out what it costs to reproduce every road. All the blue prints of cuts and fills, the specifications for every bridge, every building, all are being estimated as to value. They are rebuilding on paper every road in the United States. It is a stupendous task. They are trying to find out not only what it costs to reproduce them, but how much investment is actually represented historically. That is to say, they go over a road like the Canadian Pacific, and find out what is represented by donations from the public. The intention is to afford a basis thereby upon which the tribunal called upon to judge in the last instance shall be able to determine whether the receipts are yielding a fair return or not. This may affect the side of the question so far as the rates to shippers is concerned, but obviously it has no bearing on the other side, the willingness of capital to come forward and offer for development that which the

roads will steadily need. Unless there is a sufficiently generous attitude of the Government, it is obviously certain that these roads cannot proceed farther extending their lines as must be necessary in a rapidly growing country. Yet, bearing that in mind, I still venture to assert that this very valuation is necessary to meet the situation. If we had had an inventory of the New England railroad, trolley lines and steamship lines, it might not have been possible for investors to have lost the millions of dollars which have gone to waste. Had an inventory of the component parts of the Rock Island system been available some of the scandal at least attaching to that road might have been prevented. The amount of the investment should certainly mean something, and stand in some relation to the assets. If the situation does not promise results to the investor as it should, the courts will be the more likely to favor them in all possible ways.

There is another detail which is now upon the *tapis*, and which, I venture to suggest, may sometime become of interest to you in Canada. It has not yet passed beyond the individual States. Much as we may criticize or object to the division of authority between the Federal power and fifty different States, there is some advantage in that division, because it is the little States which experiment here and there, so that if it seems worth while the Federal Government can carry on the good work in due time. A number of our States have already passed beyond the stage of merely regulating rates, and have taken under their control and supervision the issuance of securities. This, however, is so burdensome and bothersome when controlled piecemeal, to judge from the great systems which cover many States, that it is better for them if the control be exercised by one central authority, rather than by these numerous single ones. As a matter of fact no fewer than eighteen different States in the last five or six years have given over the control of their rates and securities in this way to what are called Public Service Commissions, and had it not been for other and more pressing matters associated with what we call the "New Freedom," no doubt Federal legislation also might have followed along this line.

Every loss to investors, every scandal like the New Haven or Rock Island, has emphasized the need of a law of this kind by the Federal Government. It seems to be a particular detail of the general program, of governmental control, upon which we have entered so definitely.

This whole program in relation to the state control of the issue of securities is accompanied by a very great change of

attitude towards things which used to be regarded entirely as the property of private stock holders. Twenty years ago no one ventured to suggest that the surplus earnings of a corporation which they did not choose to divide among their owners belonged in any way to the public. Yet one is compelled to estimate surplus earnings much, as the American Telephone Company in its annual report for 1912, adopts this policy definitely, regarding its surplus as "guarantee fund," to be administered for the general interest of the public and the investors alike. It does not look just now as though there need be much discussion about surplus railroad earnings. But of course the controversy may arise either as to whether such surplus is the joint property of the public and the stock holders, or whether deficits shall also share in like manner. That brings us face to face with the question of possible state guarantee of securities issued by railroads.

We have thus reached a point in the United States where Government ownership looms in the background, not to come yet for a good while, I hope,—for I should regard it as a great catastrophe for the United States. But unless regulation is wisely administered,—unless administered in so liberal a way that a fair return and an encouraging return shall be given to capital, the improvements and development so necessary to progress will not be made. And there will be no other alternative except for the Government to step in either in the capacity of an owner or in some other way so that capital would be guaranteed the right to a fair return.

The situation in the United States may not unlikely drift into this condition of threatening public ownership. A few years ago I had the good fortune to meet many British railway men in England. It surprised me not a little to learn that under the inviting guarantee of the British Government to purchase at high prices, many owners of securities were inclined to contemplate public ownership with equanimity. If we go on in the United States without a definitely constructive policy of public regulation which will amply encourage private capital investors may well look forward to the prospect of unloading their burdens on the shoulders of Uncle Sam. In conclusion, it is suggested, that our experiment of regulations under purely private ownership emphasizes the need of great foresight in the matters of financing railroads; so that there shall be a more liberal provision made both by private management and by the State, for all those unproductive expenditures which are bound to become insistent in the course of time; and that the proper attitude for the Government

is to take fully into consideration not alone the immediate need that the shipper get as low rates as are consistent with good service, but also that the Government should keep an eye all the time to assure ample encouragement to capital to come forward for investment. This is just as much in the interest of the shipper as it is of the public at large.

I thank you for your attention. (Applause.)

(November 23, 1914.)

The Development of German Policy Through the Nineteenth Century

BY PROFESSOR J. L. MORISON.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club, held on the 23rd November, Professor Morison said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen.—As your Chairman started the Scottish line of argument, may I give this northern reminiscence? In a little village where we lived there was a clergyman who had among his friends many of the professoriate, and, when he wanted a Sunday off, he would call on one of the professors to officiate. One day a woman coming to the church asked one of the officials, "Who is it to-day, John?" "Another of the d—— professors," was the answer. (Laughter.) Now, gentlemen, that story has nothing to do with my subject, but I always speak with the criticism of the official in my mind.

I wish to take ten years of German history—ten of the most fateful in that history—and analyze them, so as to prove that at the bottom the present German policy is not any creation of the present Kaiser, or sudden spasm of Teutonic madness, but a thing older than the Prussian monarchy itself. The years I mention are those from 1861 to 1871.

Before coming to the accession of the man who became the first German Emperor I wish to take up the four great principles which seem to me to be at the bottom of German policy. In the first place we must remember that the Hohenzollerns are a dominant fact in Prussia and Germany. Few romances in history are so wonderful as that of this family. The policy of Germany is the policy of the family which governs it. This family began as rulers of a little State, then became Electors of a Province, then Kings of a kingdom, and finally Emperors of a united Germany. You in Canada know what an "Aberdonian" is. (Laughter.) May I say, that the

* Professor J. L. Morison, after a distinguished career on the Faculty of the University of Glasgow, came to Queen's University a few years ago to occupy the chair of Modern History. He is the author of several historical works, and is a notable contributor to historical publications.

Hohenzollerns are the Aberdonians of Germany, with the peculiar faculty for acquisition, for laying hold and keeping hold, which is one of the characteristics of that corner of Scotland, the same dour, common sense, varied in Aberdeen by—say, whiskey,—among the Hohenzollerns by outbursts of genius or madness. I say this not to criticize Aberdeen, but to praise the Hohenzollerns. Of this great Hohenzollern family hardly one failed to leave his mark in Germany.

Now, that family, struggling for existence, laying hold of new and ever new positions, that family developed individuality to a heroic, to a criminal extent. Further, that family as it gained power over provinces and peoples tended to regard them as its own property, for while for us of the British Empire it is natural to speak of the people and the land, it is just as natural for the Prussians and the Hohenzollerns to speak of the land and the people as belonging in a peculiar sense to the ruling dynasty, and to call that dynasty the makers of the Prussian State and the German Empire.

The second fact we must remember is that when struggling to get to the top, that family was forced to take possessions where it could. Prussian territory used to be scattered over the map of Europe in a strange, enfeebling way. In the 18th century there were three clear groups: the provinces near the Rhine, the heart of Prussian dominion around Berlin, and East Prussia, with a great gap between it and Berlin. Now, gentlemen, geography dominates national policy: you cannot avoid being pushed where your geography pushes you. The Hohenzollerns faced that weakness of scattered territory, and had to plan to fill in the gaps—in other words, they faced a position different from the British in their secure little islands.

The third fact one must remember is that these territories were islands in the midst of a sea of foes. From the 17th to the 19th century there were many warring German States. The Prussian Hohenzollerns had to fight their way to the top in spite of these, whether Hanoverians, Saxons or Württembergers. They had to break them first, before making them into Germany. Again, there were not only these German enemies, but there was Russia to the east, a diplomatic thundercloud, bearing with it a fateful sense of something threatening on the eastern horizon. We have had our scares about Russia in India, but how would we have felt if we had just across our borders that active threat? And again there was Austria. Austrian control of Germany was the last fragment of one of the greatest dreams human history has ever seen. In the Middle Ages they thought of Christendom as united: the

Emperor was the partner of the Pope, in maintaining a great united Christendom. In the 18th and 19th centuries Austria, into whose hands the Holy Roman Empire had fallen, had relaxed her grip and was deficient in strength, but still had power enough to keep Germany from becoming one and truly German. And there was France. I believe the *Entente Cordiale* is something deep and real in our history; but I say this, that if I had been a German of Bismarck's time, as I am a Scotchman, with the traditions of hate and the sense of wrongs which French policy to Germany has generated in the past, I should never have rested until I had flung the Frenchman back on his own territory, and given Germany free scope. Think of it! The Reformation saw France begin her interferences. In the 17th century the greatest French statesman, Cardinal Richelieu, exploited the weakness of Germany, and Louis XIV. made his greatest gains at the expense of Germany. In the 19th century the greatest of all French leaders, Napoleon—of course he was Italian by race—prostrated Germany, trampled her in the dust, tore her to pieces. The Prussian Royal family remembered this, for one of their best loved Queens had died of a broken heart because of Napoleon's outrages on her country. If I had been a German, as I am a Scotchman, anti-French feeling would have been born with me, and I should have cherished it to my dying day.

You must remember this, that the Prussian State had enemies, insidious enemies.

The fourth great fact of German history is to be found in that curious system of guile and force, by which the Hohenzollerns met their other difficulties; that system of force and cunning which found its fullest expression in Frederick the Great. Becky Sharp, according to Thackeray, said, "it is easy to be virtuous on ten thousand a year." It was very hard for the Prussians to be virtuous on the little income they had. Frederick organized the Hohenzollerns' property in such a way that the world remembers the strokes he dealt. He determined that democracy might do for England, but Prussia must have an autocracy. Good faith! that was of no account. He would lie, would make treaties and break them, tear them up as "scraps of paper," if he might thereby advance Prussia. He looked around and saw hostile faces—he must have an army, and so he created a military force great without parallel in European history. And so came into existence that curious mixture of despotism, militarism, and Machiavellianism, which we can best explain as the product of the natural position of Prussia among the other peoples. Anyone who would

criticize German policy, or the policy of the great Bismarck, must remember this fact; he will not otherwise be fair to Germany.

Now, I come to my ten years. In 1861 the King who was to become Emperor William I. of a united Germany ascended the Prussian throne. There had been an interregnum since Frederick's death. The army had been allowed to stand on its reputation, but Napoleon had shattered it in a single day. After Napoleon the Prussian autocracy had weakened, democratic experiments were being made, and in external relations, Prussia was at the beck and call of Austria. To the military humiliation of Jena was added the diplomatic humiliation of Olmütz. If we call the Germans despots to-day, we should remember that one of the supremely honest and moderate Hohenzollerns, Frederick William III., paid the penalty of his honesty and moderation by seeing Prussia reduced to a second or even a third rate State. The new King was bent on pursuing the fortunes of his house, and not allowing them to suffer damage at his hands.

Around him he gathered a little circle of men, the like of whom have seldom been seen in human history. One was Roon, Minister of War, and next Roon, Moltke, the greatest strategist of modern times. But it was a Prussian Junker, Bismarck, whose virile mind, and relentless patriotism gathered into one what the others did, and made the modern German Empire. These four men then made the Germany we are fighting to-day. The lines on which they built modern Germany were conspicuously broad and sweeping. It was their first duty to rebuild the Prussian State; they were determined to make a united Germany, to make it really German.

All of them, but more especially Bismarck, saw that the people could not help them; they were not instructed sufficiently in practical affairs. Wherever Germany was democratic, Germany was weak. There was an old proverb, that Germany ruled the clouds, as France ruled the land. That was the old policy, but Bismarck saw that a Germany that ruled the clouds could not rule the land. It is easy for us to be benevolent with our channel and seas around us, but if our very physical existence was assailed would we not feel very different. We might be willing, perhaps, to do what the Germans did, according to the scheme of Bismarck, and accept autocracy. For Bismarck's principles were despotic.

Of the milder influences in politics he took little stock. "I have always felt distrust of politicians in long skirts, whether women or ecclesiastics," he once snarled. As for the

•

main system, this was not, he thought, a question of Liberal or Conservative of this or that shade, but rather of monarchical rule as against parliamentary government, and the latter must be avoided at all costs if even by a period of dictatorship. Along with this despotic system Bismarck, and his king, pursued a course of diplomatic Machiavellianism, if I may call it so. Now in Machiavellianism there was no place for moral ideas; with Machiavelli, whose Prince is one of the great political documents of the world, all state actions were judged by what they could do for Italy; he justified bad faith and all other things by that patriotic test. Like Machiavelli, Bismarck saw Germany, Germany united and saved, and it was easy to cover up a multitude of sins committed in her service. He made alliances, but alliances for Bismarck were worth just as much as they were worth to Prussia; when they ceased to be useful he broke them, tore them up; he made treaties and broke them as Frederick had done. He was the first of modern statesmen who planned wars beforehand, and brought the wars on, to have Europe settled to his satisfaction. At times one wonders whether this man is not the devil in German form; yet one recognizes that behind it all, behind the lying, the deceit, the intrigue, is the ideal of a united German territory, a Germany not scattered but united, and standing on her own feet.

Curiously enough, in that Bismarckian system, peace always had been made an ideal. Bismarck intended that when war had established the unity of Germany within possible limits, evidence would be given not only to the smaller European States but also to the great powers, which would convince them that German policy could be just and peaceful. And Bismarck kept his word. He brought wars on, but when the end was attained, he ceased to fight. I do not know any way in which German policy has degenerated so markedly as in the abandonment of that moderation which led Bismarck to say, "Strike, and strike hard, but when the need for blows is over, cease."

The other great note of Bismarckian policy was militarism. It was "Blood and Iron"—nothing else could do the work! So Roon and Moltke planned that invincible machine of theirs. They took the outlines from the man who helped to end Napoleon;—it is a curious fact that Scharnhorst started the modern German army on the lines of the British militia; and so the English "contemptible little army" gave the great German machine its first idea in the 19th century! Moltke and Bismarck took every scientific invention—railways, telegraphs,

all modern details and contrivances and brought them to great perfection, and wedded them to war. Consequently, when battle came, nothing could stand the shock. One may also add that it was Moltke's perfect system of war intelligence which by later degeneration has created the modern German network of espionage. It was the object of Moltke to provide for the chances of war. He had to know what his enemies were doing.

I have tried to show you, briefly, a little State growing great under a great family. It is easy seeing how that State, when it had a despot over it, when it had its policy settled and forceful, and when it had an army equal to its fears and its ambitions, could not but take a first place in Europe. This it had accomplished by 1871. The wicked flourish like a green bay tree, and when they die they sleep with their fathers. No doubt the reflections of Bismarck and of Frederick (if they are still permitted to have reflections) before this war started were those of high satisfaction.

And now, may I relate these facts to our present situation. The battle before us is more terrible because it is a battle of real great opposing principles. I go to your book shops, and see piles of literary slush—exaggerations, contortions, lies! The suggestion is that we are fighting fools and weaklings. Gentlemen, we shall never beat Germany along that line! (Hear, hear.) We must face facts: they are plain and straight before us. Those great ten years, the period of the Austrian and Franco-Prussian wars, were great because of their despotism, their Machiavellianism, their militarism. Does that mean that I assent to those principles? No! I am a democrat. I believe in internationalism; and Heaven save us from the horrors of continental conscription! But I say this, that in face of the German system with its reality we must provide a substitute as real! (Applause.) Gentlemen, we are all democrats here, whether Liberals or Tories, but has not our democracy been too often a thing flaccid or worse, tainted with graft, within grasp of the plutocrat? (Hear, hear.) I tell you, if that enfeebled democracy is to fling itself against the Prussian autocracy, it will be beaten! Nothing but absolutely true, stern stuff will bear the strain! (Applause.)

Gentlemen, we speak lightly of internationalism; I wonder if we realize our responsibilities therein. I thank Heaven Mr. Asquith has begun to define his position and future programme. In one of his recruiting speeches he hints at the creation of a general federation of peoples, wherein the old system of opposing alliances, and the balance of power will

have gone, and a new world of international agreements and arbitration will have taken its place. That such a dream is more than a mere dream Britain and America proved by that greatest of international agreements, the Geneva arbitration. Sir Edward Grey spoke, last July, of the impossibility up to that time of giving so Utopian an idea definite embodiment in a proposal. But the war has changed all that, and Britain at least, if Heaven sends her victory, will utilize her triumph for that high purpose, and not for self-aggrandisement. Now, whether that system comes definitely into existence or only begins to be when the war is over, the ultimate success will depend on the preachers, journalists, teachers, and lawyers of the Empire giving their soundest energies to build the new internationalism. In law it must henceforth be the aim of the most ambitious to civilize international relationships, and to invent courts, and laws, and create a legal temper, which will enable great nations to settle their disputes outside the battlefield. The teacher must remember that if peace, indeed, have her victories no less renowned than war, children must be taught the nature of these victories, and that the cheap and only too easily effective appeals of battle stories must have companion stories of heroic peace, as thrilling, memorable, and more moral. The new journalism must accept, as the old has never done, its moral responsibilities, and no longer egg men on by foolish passion, and cheap rhetoric, and exciting falsehoods. We must produce against Bismarck as notable a system, and must put ourselves on the side of good faith, treaties, and international law. (Applause.)

Gentlemen, we are denouncing, and rightly denouncing Prussian militarism; but I tell you, the democracies of the world, especially this Empire, must provide something as virile as that system which we are fighting! (Applause.) Our young men must be trained from their very boyhood to wise restraint, and the life of the open air, to be strong and clean, must put aside the lackadaisical, vicious habits which have been affecting us. (Hear, hear.) And that is not all, gentlemen. So long as the militarism of Prussia is in the world, that power must be faced. I do hate conscription, but our youth must be trained in habits of self defence. I want to see every man in the Empire trained till at the age of twenty-five he is able to defend himself and the Empire against any possible threat of militarism. (Hear, hear.)

I tell you this is a problem of our Empire, to steer between the Scylla of conscription and the Charybdis of unprepared-

ness. Don't kill the Kaiser with your mouth! Don't invent those silly fables about atrocities that never happened—some may have happened, but don't invent them—be Britons! (Applause.) Meet force with force as genuine, but more righteous. Only by basing your system on something as fundamental as "Prussianism" can you meet and conquer the power of militarism.

Let me close with these lines from Kipling, which describe for me the temper that will carry us safe through this crisis, without violating our old traditions and moral standards:—

If you can keep your head, when all about you
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you;
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you
But make allowance for their doubting, too;
If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,
Or being lied about, don't deal in lies; (That is, atrocities)
Or being hated, don't give way to hating;
And yet don't look too good, nor talk too wise.

If you can dream—and not make dreams your master;
If you can think—and not make thoughts your aim;
If you can meet with Triumph and Disaster,
And treat those two impostors just the same;
If you can bear to hear the truth you've spoken
Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools;
Or watch the things you gave your life to, broken,
And stoop and build 'em up with worn out tools.

If you can make one heap of all your winnings
And risk it on one turn of pitch-and-toss,
And lose, and start again at your beginnings,
And never breathe a word about your loss;
If you can force your heart and nerve and sinew
To serve your turn long after they are gone,
And so hold on when there is nothing in you
Except the Will which says to them: "Hold on!"

If you can talk to crowds and keep your virtue, (Pretty hard)
Or walk with Kings—nor lose the common touch;
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you;
If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run;
Yours is the Earth and everything that's in it.
And—which is more—you'll be a Man, my son!

And, gentlemen, if we play the game in the true British fashion, the flags will be flying (the Union Jack, not the German flag), five hundred years hence, as fearlessly as they are flying to-day, and the British Empire will be standing, as proof that German despotism, militarism, and Machiavellianism are not the last word in the history of the nation! (Long and hearty applause.)

(November 30, 1914.)

The Deeper Causes of the War

BY DR. STEPHEN S. WISE.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club, held on the 30th November, Dr. Wise said:

Mr. Chairman and Fellow Neutrals (laughter).—I have been very eager to escape from my country for some time, though I had not possibly the same urgent motives for escaping that are commonly attributed to residents of the States who transfer their residence from our land to your own (laughter), but, gentlemen, I am glad to get away from my own country for the first time in my life, and to remain away long enough to say I am not a neutral. (Laughter, and applause.) Only one thing makes me hesitate about giving full expression to my spirit of neutrality while I am out of my own country. I remember, some years ago, Mark Twain said, when speaking in England, "Here in England, as in America, when I stand under the British flag, I am not a stranger, I am not an alien, I am at home!" And if I hesitate to give expression to my un-neutral feelings to-day, it is only because I feel that I am at home. (Applause.)

I read to-day—I know not whether it was in one of our papers or one of your own—and I wish every paper, every newspaper in America, were as good as the one edited by my friend, who belongs to us as to you, Dr. J. A. Macdonald—that while Germany is fighting for the future, England is fighting for coin. Now I am sorry only for the man who said that, because that man has not passed beyond the elementary stage of barbarism. Any man who will think of looking upon a great people like the British people, and say you are fighting to-day for coin, money, or trade, does not understand the British people, and is incapable of rising to the dignity and the reason of a great and noble, unselfish act. (Applause.) We feel in the States,—that is, some of us do—that England's fighting is not chiefly for England at all. I am not a neutral! My deepest sympathies and my deepest hopes are with the Allies (applause), because I feel that you

* Dr. Wise is Rabbi of the Free Synagogue in New York City, and is generally regarded as one of the ablest leaders among the Jewish Race in America. He is prominent in civic welfare work and social reform, and is a speaker of outstanding ability.

and France together are fighting, not for England and France and Belgium, but that you are fighting for civilization, and because I feel you are fighting the cause of ordered democracy against autocratic militarism. (Applause.)

Now, gentlemen, in my lifetime, I have been in contact from time to time with Canadian Clubs, in a fluid state. (Laughter.) Canadian Clubs that have been less stable and less firm than this company which names itself the Canadian Club. In fact, I think in America there is nothing Canadian half as popular as "Canadian Club." (Laughter.) And I suppose Canada is particularly popular in my own country because this part of Canada has been so largely settled by, and is to-day occupied by Scots, the Scots of whom we in America often hear, "Scots wha hae wi' Wallace bled," and have been bleeding the rest of the world ever since! (Laughter.) You take me a little more kindly than did an English audience to which I once stupidly tried to say that I wondered whether England was called the "tight little island" because of the number of tight little Islanders in it. (Laughter.)

Talking about Scots, I am particularly interested in them because of that English story which recurs to me, so English that you will feel justified in lynching me for telling it you, the story of that poor Englishman, perhaps an immigrant from Canada, who was looking disconsolate in London, and when asked about business, he said, "Don't ask about business at all." "What's the matter?" said the other, "Is business so bad?" "Is it bad?" he replied; "I buy from the Scotch, and I sell to the Jews!" (Laughter.)

You know my people, my brothers in faith, have never lived in large numbers in Scotland. There are three places on earth where Jews can't even make a living: one is in New England, which is a sort of Yankeeified Caledonia; the second is China,—as I told my friend, Mr. Wu, some years ago; and the third is Scotland.

I wonder whether I may detain you long enough—though the Chairman has warned me of the limitations of time within which I am required to circumscribe myself—to tell you of the word I exchanged with a member of the English Cabinet some years ago, when invited to go with him along the classic Thames Embankment. Mrs. Wise and I were looking on the Thames, and our host said, "Not long ago, a young lady from America was here, and some one spoke of the river. 'This a river, is it?' she exclaimed. 'This is just a pool or a brook. Why, the Mississippi is twenty times as large as the Thames!' 'Yes,' I replied, 'of course; but the Mississippi is just a river,

while the Thames is liquid history!" (Applause.) The story reminds me of the contrast between the Thames and the Mississippi, you remember it—someone asked whether the Thames was as large as the Mississippi; "As large!" exclaimed the person spoken to, "why, there is not enough water in the Thames to serve as a gargle for one of the mouths of the Mississippi!" (Laughter.)

Some years ago, I was traveling to my own country, and on the way across a storm arose, and an American woman said to her little son, "James, I want you to go to the state-room and get into your pajamas and go to bed. There is going to be a severe storm, and I want you to be asleep through it." James went down, but after an hour his mother followed, and found him, not in his pajamas but wrapped in an American flag. When James was asked why this absurd performance, he said, "You know, mother, you said there was going to be a bad storm, and I thought the boat might go down. Now this is an English boat, but I want God to know I'm an American." (Laughter.) Now, I told that story in England at a dinner—and by the way I heard the best after dinner speeches there that I ever heard—I told that story, and just after telling it I observed an old Englishman that looked very sad, very much depressed and very dismal. I tried to counteract some part of the damage I had done, by saying, "Of course, you know the average American feels that if he were not an American he would like to be an Englishman!" But this was more than he could stand. He got up and said, "The Rabbi says if he were not an American he would like to be an Englishman; if I were not an Englishman, I should not want to be alive!" (Laughter.)

I wonder whether I should tell you, by way of closing the preliminaries of my address (laughter), the story of the Rabbi. One night an Irishman in New York was taken very sick, being stricken with the smallpox. He turned to his wife and said, "Bridget, I feel I am going to die, and I want the last rites; send for the Jewish Rabbi." Bridget thought poor Patrick was out of his head with the disease, but thought she had better humor him, so she said, "Ah, now, Patrick, ye're not going to die, but if ye want the last rites all right, but Patrick, dear, ye don't want the Rabbi, but our own good priest." But Patrick insisted that he wanted the Rabbi. "Do ye think," he said, "I want our priest to get the smallpox?" (Laughter.) So when I, gentlemen, an American, face a company of Canadians, and a Jew, face a company of Christians, as I hope you are. (Laughter.) I should have to ask my

good friend about that—I wonder what it is that I am going to catch! (Laughter.)

Gentlemen, I want to deal, in just the few minutes before you have got to leave me, whether I leave you or not, about fourteen minutes, (Cries of "Go on!")—I haven't begun yet! (Laughter.) I want to deal, if I may, with the deeper causes of the war; not the obvious, not the immediate causes of the war, not the things of which we all know and have thought, but, shall I say, the implicit, indirect causes of the war, which have brought on the war that is, and all wars, and as a result of which causes war will continue to be.

For one thing, gentlemen, we shall not have an end of war as long as you and I feel that man is a fighting animal, and therefore must forever fight. I am not maintaining to-day, nor could I bring myself to maintain, that this war is an unnecessary one from my point of view, or that this war could have been averted, for I think Sir Edward Grey did everything that a man and a gentleman could do to make this war impossible. (Applause.) And I do say, and I take it every Canadian feels the same way, whether this war was inevitable or not, you don't believe in the permanent continuance of war and of all warfare. I say, as long as we are guilty of the moral and spiritual heresy that man is a fighting animal we are going to have no end of war. Man *was* a fighting animal; a *thing* became man through fighting; but if you are going to declare that man is a fighting animal, and therefore must forever be such, your theory has reference only to man's origin, which is down in the deeps, and ignores man's destiny, which is in the highest heights. (Applause.) In other words, gentlemen, man became what he is, a thing became man, through warring and fighting, but if man is going to rise one step higher, it will be because of the cessation of warfare. In a better world, in a truer world, a world in which law and religion obtain, whether yours or mine, there will be no room for war. Whether war is necessary to-day or not, this one thing has got to go! (Hear, hear.)

Now, I know some of you may not agree with me herein, but I pay you the compliment, as Dante said, of flattering you by truth speaking, by saying not that which you think I should think, but what I really believe. I think if there is one thing Englishmen want to hear, it is what the other man really believes. (Hear, hear.) Having said what I did, and abating not one jot or tittle of my admiration for Sir Edward Grey, we are not going to have an end of war until we have an end of secret, stealthy, underground diplomacy. (Hear,

hear.) That is a serious thing to say to a company of men like this.

If Russia and Germany, Austria and France, and above all the German and Austrian people, who did not want war, understood all the hidden felicities of speech and action by the Chancelleries of the respective countries between the 24th of July and the 3rd of August, this awful world carnage would not have been. They never would have suffered themselves to be flung into this hell of war by the secret diplomacy which obtained and obtains.

Now, you English gentlemen and others have been laughing for a century at our "shirt sleeve diplomacy." Now, perhaps, you will agree with me when I say that we have blundered along almost as well as have the Britishers. We have got along with our "shirt sleeve diplomacy"—we have another definition of it: you remember what Bismarck said—Bismarck, the man, I believe, who is truly responsible for this war and for all that Bernhardt and the German ministry of to-day are saying and doing, and this war is the inevitable result of Bismarckianism and of nothing else,—I find in a recently published book by John Morley—Lord Morley, if you please—the remark of Bismarck quoted, that "diplomacy is the art of passing bad money." Perhaps you gentlemen know what that is in Canada. (Laughter.) Now, Bismarck knew what diplomacy was; as to bad money, he never passed any other, diplomatically and internationally!

The Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount, "Thou shalt not covet," "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not kill," are just as binding upon the nation as upon the individual. (Applause.) And we have got to learn that; all of us have got to learn that; and I think, gentlemen, you will be eager and proud to agree with me, that our own country has given one of the finest imaginable illustrations of accepting the mandate of the Decalogue as binding upon international relations; I refer to the President of the United States, a wise and noble statesman. (Hearty applause.) You remember how about a year ago he insisted that the American people be mindful of that verse in the Hebrew Bible, "He that sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not." We had sworn to our own hurt, it may be, but Woodrow Wilson cared nothing about that! the American people must be true to their pledge! They must go on and deal with absolutely undeviating justice, first with England and then with all nations of the earth! And we did! (Applause.) You know, gentlemen, what this "Shirt sleeve diplomacy" should be named, and will be named; the name was given by a great American statesman, who is not as well

known to you as some other leading political figures, the one time Ambassador at the Court of St. James, from our country, John Hay,—the “Golden Rule diplomacy,” (applause) a diplomacy upon which the nations of the earth have got to agree, and if they fail to agree thereon we shall have no end of the kind of war that now is raging.

Now, gentlemen, a third cause of the war I want to mention,—I see I have three minutes. (Cries of “Go on!”) I will keep you posted about the time—the third cause—I wish there were an exit facility offered to me so that I might disappear without unnecessary peril, for I have one widow and two orphans dependent upon me, that is, if you should put an end to me here! I will not commit myself here in my own thought, but say what would be my own thought, if I were not a clergyman, and free to have a thought! (Laughter.) Gentlemen, we shall have no end of war as long as women are shut out from government! (Laughter and applause)—I knew that. (Laughter)—And Sylvia didn’t ask me to say it, either! (Laughter.)

Now, gentlemen, I am going to talk to you about that for a moment. War began, a war that embraces more than half the nations of the earth—somehow I think I can appeal to you, because you are fair, and Englishmen are said to like fair play,—do you think it is fair,—I put it that way,—that it should have begun without asking a single woman on earth whether the war should be? Women don’t bear arms. No, they don’t! they merely bear armies! Gentlemen, be fair! Who bears the first, heaviest, and last cost of war? (Hear, hear.) Men may die: they have the choice and the glory of dying upon the battlefields. But woman has got to live on for a decade or a generation or two after the battle is over! The bitterest cost of the war is borne by women! (Hear, hear.) I tell you, gentlemen, even if apparently you are not prepared to accept universal suffrage in Canada, judging by the looks on your faces at this moment, I tell you, we shall not have an end of war until the mothers have a share in government. (Applause.) For women know what war means. You own fellow-Englishwoman, Olive Schreiner, says, “Woman counts war in the cost of flesh, life, love.”

I tell you, what I resent as a churchman, a religionist! I resent the actions of your country and of France and Germany and Russia, in asking, inviting, sanctioning, urging, what are war marriages. What are they? Marriages women contract with men, to which in many cases children will be born, and then the father of may be three or six children will never come back alive to see them. The British Government

and other Governments wish to neutralize the heavy death rate, and I think what it means—I am going to use simple, plain terms—is asking women to make of themselves breeding machines, so your birth rate can be equal to and neutralize your death rate! (Hear, hear.) When the nations of the world see the nations of civilization and of Christendom act in such a way that women would be asked to contract trial marriages,—for that is in effect what they are—to make of themselves breeding machines,—do you think that would be the case if women were to have a share in government? Would it not soon pass away, this pain, this agony, this tragedy which has been laid upon the soul of woman?

Now, gentlemen, I come to the last cause with which I want to deal to-day. The first is militarism, and second, that final cause of war, more responsible than all else. What is militarism? You have an army, and a *rather* good navy; we think it is almost comparable to our own—surely we could pay you no higher compliment than that! (Laughter.) And yet, I think, England is not a militarist nation. (Hear, hear.) She is essentially as far removed from militarism as the United States of America. Militarism means the subordinating of the civil to the military arm of the government. I'd like to see the English Government try for five minutes to subordinate the civil to the military arm! You want your army and navy to be triumphant, but in their own place, but you are master of the army and the navy, and Englishmen will never permit the army and the navy to govern them. (Applause.) And then a militaristic nation, gentlemen, is one which dreams of military conquest, of achieving military glory, which believes not in that old maxim of my fathers, "Not by might nor by power, but by My Spirit," but, as some nations of the earth to-day, "Not by the Spirit, but by the exigencies of the case, but by might and by brute power alone, shall man prevail." I dare say no man on earth would accuse England of being a truly militaristic country, but we in our land see the peril of being flung over the abyss of militarism as a result of this war. I heard a great American statesman a few days ago, whom I may not mention, speaking reflectively on the moral causes of the war,—and he was just as neutral as the speaker,—(laughter)—say that he trusted England would be splendidly triumphant, because if England should be defeated—he felt, as I believe you all feel, that such defeat is unthinkable (hear, hear, and applause)—if England were defeated, if the cause of the Allies should fail, America would have to embark upon a great militaristic adventure, and we should have a mighty army and a mighty navy; and we don't

want either! (Applause.) We need no army in America, because the only land from which we are in any danger is only Canada. (Laughter.) You know, we used to say in America that there were only two things to do to Canada: either to swallow it or smash it. Now, we have come to say, that we could not smash it, and we would not swallow it! (Laughter.) We don't need an army in America. Along a frontier of three thousand miles, is it not? (A voice, "Four thousand.") I thank God to-day, for a hundred years you and we have maintained unbroken peace, not only because the influence of that hundred years unbroken is a prevision of another thousand years of peace between the great Dominion of Canada and our great democracy to the south, but because that hundred years means that never, never can there be division or strife between the two great English-speaking nations of earth! (Hearty applause.) When the test comes, when the challenge comes, we know who our friends and our kinsmen are, and we don't forget, and we never will forget, that not Germany, but England, is the Mother of Liberty. (Hear, hear.) And I say that, gentlemen, with the deepest feeling of my soul, because I am an American and a Jew. I know, if my people throughout America have been lifted to a higher state, it is because of the leadership of England throughout the world. (Applause.) And, gentlemen, I have felt that there was something almost providential, surely, when a Jew by birth, a statesman and a great Englishman, had the unparalleled joy of placing upon the head of the sovereign Queen of your land the crown of the Indian Empire, which means so much in loyalty for the divisions of the Empire. (Applause.)

We don't need a big army in America, and we don't want a big navy. Those of us Americans who are sober,—and some of us sometimes are, because we can't afford enough "Canadian Club" (laughter)—say we are not going to be Hobsonized—if you happen to know that ludicrous personality—or William-Randolph-Hearstified, into war with Japan. (Hear, hear.) There is no more reason for war with that nation than with any other. There is room under the sun—poor sun, how badly abused!—(laughter)—room for both Japan and our own democracy. (Hear, hear.)

Now, gentlemen, what does this really mean in our own diplomacy? We are going after a program for which we are going to be called mollicoddles by such persons as that model of strenuosity who has gone over this and all continents of the earth, a very great American, whom we all love, even when we think he is wrong, because he is a great American. But in despite of him and his followers we do hold that we have

no room in our country for a militaristic program; we want none of it! (Applause.) Some day, gentlemen, the test is going to come to us. You may not agree with me here again, but I ask you this question:

I should suffer myself to be slain, sooner than do that! Some day, gentlemen, some day my Government may ask me to slay a man who speaks a tongue other than my own, of a race different from mine, of a faith I do not hold; and I am going to say it to my Government, not in vain repetition of that recently resurrected barbarism, "My spear knows no brother!" but I am going to say, because I am a churchman, because I believe in the reign of God in the world, "My brother, white, yellow, red, brown or black, American, Asiatic, European or African, Jew, Christian or unbeliever, shall know no spear of mine!" And when we say that, then war will end! (Applause.)

And gentlemen, if you think I am very radical, I am not more radical than the church to the right or to the left. The trouble is, gentlemen, I am only a Jew; I make the mistake of taking Christianity seriously. (Hear, hear.) You see, I am unlike Christians in that. (Laughter and applause.) I really assume that Jesus meant what He said. (Hear, hear.) I really assume and believe there is no place in this world for war and religion at the same time. (Hear, hear, and applause.) One or the other has got to go! (Applause.) If you hold, with Treitschke and Bernhardi and Nietzsche, you will say Christianity must go; but if you agree with some of us who are willing to be dubbed mollicoddles, we say war has got to go, and will go! (Applause.) And religion, the religion of Israel and the religion of that Jew of Jews, Jesus of Nazareth, will not go! (Applause.)

Just a minute or two longer, then I will release you; if I don't, there will be another exodus, not of the children of Israel, but of one child of Israel! (Laughter.) Gentlemen, back of this war, and of all wars, is something else, just racial and national hatreds, passions, bitternesses and prejudices; and as long as we suffer these things to be, war will be. You can't get rid of war until you rout out of the heart of man the prejudices which obtain, all the mean racial prejudices and bitternesses. Some of us get the impossible notion into our heads that there must be one race and language, one religion and faith. But, gentlemen, we forget that in God's world there is room for every variety and type of race and people and faith. This world would be insufferably stale and unprofitable if there were only one faith or one language or one people. I love England and the Englishmen, but oh! what a

dreary world it would be if there were none but Englishmen on earth! (Laughter and applause.) What is it that constitutes the charm, the majesty, the glory of Britain? That it is a great *causerie* of heterogeneous peoples! And in spite of what John Milton called three hundred years ago "Brotherly dissimilarities," they have been forged and merged into one great British Empire. You don't need uniformity to have unity. Your Scotch and Welsh and English and Irish and all other tongues and faiths, find room in the Empire, and Britain's greatness is above all and over all due to the fact that the Englishman knows what tolerance is: his horizon is as wide as his Empire, and his Empire covers the world!

Suppose we could have one type of culture, (laughter) and that type of culture, gentlemen, so high that it should even surmount Termonde and Louvain,—we want no one type of culture in the world! There is just as much need in the world for little Servia as for mighty Austria, (hear, hear) and just as much need in a reconstituted world for unhappy little Belgium (applause) as for the expanding of the German Empire. (Applause.) We are only a handful of people on earth—my people are some twelve or thirteen millions—and yet I say to you to-day, as a Jew and a Jewish teacher, the greatest disservice which my people could render to the people on earth would be to be guilty of cowardice, of moral and spiritual suicide; the world needs the example of the incomparable and inflexible loyalty of the Jew to his own ideal, his own type of life and culture. I know no people on earth understand that better than the Englishmen here or anywhere. (Applause.)

Now, we have to get rid of these bigotries, these hatreds, these passions and animosities; and we will! Out of this war, and after this war, is going to come a new patience, a new sympathy, a new tolerance; and we shall respect the rights of the weaker peoples, the lesser nationalities, the smaller faiths, and not seek to crush them and root them out, because they are not as strong and cultured as we are. (Applause.)

Lastly, gentlemen, there is one word I want to say to you, but it is not necessary that it should be said. I want to speak for the last moment for my own country. You may have been deluded or deceived by reports that have come to you. I imagine Englishmen have the notion that we are all a lot of magpies, as if we were a nation of vultures, hucksters, traders, fattening upon the resources of other nations. We don't want more trade because of the war! (Hear, hear.) We want an early and honorable peace; and if America is going to have any part in the adjusting that is to come—and I be-

lieve we are (hear, hear)—because I believe America has come to share, not to dispute, with you the moral and spiritual hegemony of the peoples of earth,—there is only one thing we will ask—will you not agree with me—when the hour of victory strikes, as I pray God it come soon! We will ask you brothers, we children of Britain will ask of the Mother and of you brothers, to make no terms, to lay down no stipulations, which involve such a truce as will again renew the war! (Hear, hear, and applause.) In other words, gentlemen, when peace comes, it must stay; and it will not stay,—but now you may not agree with me—it will not stay unless England, unless Great Britain, chief of the Allies, become not only equal to herself, but greater, finer, and more magnanimous, than she has ever been before. (Applause.) I love Great Britain! So I want Great Britain to be supremely great in the hour of victory, not through crushing any nation or destroying any empire, not through dismemberment of any kingdom, but I want England to lead in establishing a foundation for peace which will be firm because it is just, lasting because honorable! And if England will be great enough, splendid enough, magnanimous enough, to make such a peace, then will England retain her hegemony among the nations of earth! And, gentlemen, whatever you are, and whatever you do, you and I, or rather you and we, Englishmen and Americans, are ever to remember and never to forget, that we are one, one in aim and one in purpose, one in devotion to liberty, and one in our passion to serve and make free the peoples of the earth! (Long applause.)

(December 5, 1914.)

Address

By RT. HON. SIR ROBERT L. BORDEN, P.C., G.C.M.G.*

AT a special meeting under the joint auspices of the Canadian Club of Toronto and the Empire Club of Canada, held on the 5th December, Sir Robert Borden said:

Your Honor, Mr. Mayor, and Gentlemen,—I appreciate very much the opportunity afforded me to-day of speaking to the members of these two Clubs. As the Mayor has pertinently observed, recent months have afforded the opportunity rather for work than for speech-making. It does seem very proper that the first public utterance that I have made since the outbreak of the war, except in the course of the Parliamentary session, should be made in this city of Toronto; and I am very glad, indeed, to acknowledge here at the outset the great feeling of appreciation that is entertained, I am sure, by all the people of Canada for what has been done in Toronto and what will still be done. When the Mayor spoke of the spirit of co-operation and mutual helpfulness which pervades the people of this city, I feel that a like spirit prevails all through this country. (Applause.) I am perhaps a little at a loss for words to describe it. "Faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." I believe that the word "charity" is translated in the New Version as "love." But neither the word "charity" nor "love" expresses precisely the spirit which I feel pervades the people of Canada at the present time. It may be described as a desire to help,—a spirit of sympathy, co-operation, self-sacrifice, a spirit which pervades men and women alike—and God bless the women of Canada for all they have done in these days of trial and stress? (Applause.)

To-day there is but one thought in our hearts, and it is fitting that I should speak to you of the appalling struggle which has been forced upon our Empire. I say forced upon us; because I am convinced that no nation ever desired peace more sincerely than the nations which compose the British

*The Right Hon. R. L. Borden, P.C., G.C.M.G., came to Toronto specially on this date to explain what Canada had done to help the Empire in the mighty struggle in which it is engaged. His address in Toronto was regarded as one of the best he has ever delivered.

Empire; that no statesmen ever wrought more to avoid war than did the statesmen of Great Britain in the weeks which immediately preceded the conflict.

There is not time nor is it necessary that I should dwell upon the occurrences which determined the issue. The great events which brought about the establishment and consolidation of the German Empire under Prussian domination are well known to you. Bismarck foreshadowed in a famous phrase the policy of the future. "The great questions are to be settled," he said in 1862, "not by speeches and majority resolutions but by blood and iron." Then came in quick succession the war against Denmark in 1864; the downfall of Austria in 1866 and the overthrow of France in 1870. The policy of blood and iron seemed to consummate the realization of that which has been the dream of Germany for centuries. Germany became an Empire; the King of Prussia became its Emperor. The military spirit of Prussia dominated German thought and German ideals. The intoxication of victory aided by a propaganda preached to every child and every young man by the foremost thinkers of Germany imposed on its people an ideal and an ambition which included the dominance of Europe and indeed of the world.

The world has only recently come to realize the astonishing teaching to which the German people have listened for the last half century. Among many others Treitschke, a great professor of history, whose influence upon the young men of Germany cannot be over-estimated, and Bernhardi, his disciple, have preached the religion of valour and of might. War has been glorified as a solemn duty for the cause of national development. They proclaimed that the State is not only justified but bound to put aside all obligations and to disregard all treaties insofar as they may conflict with its highest interest. "War," said Bernhardi, "is in itself a good thing. It is a biological necessity of the first importance. . . . War is the greatest factor in the furtherance of culture and power. Efforts to secure peace are extraordinarily detrimental as soon as they influence politics. . . . Efforts directed toward the abolition of war are not only foolish but absolutely immoral and must be stigmatized as unworthy of the human race. . . . Courts of arbitration are a pernicious delusion. The whole idea represents a presumptuous encroachment on natural laws of development which can only lead to the most disastrous consequences for humanity generally. . . . The maintenance of peace never can be or may be the goal of a policy. . . . Efforts for peace would if they attained their goal lead to degeneration. . . .

Huge armaments are in themselves desirable. They are the most necessary precondition of our national health."

The profound influence of this teaching upon the German people may be realized from their unquestioning support of the enormous increase in their military and naval forces. Beyond question Germany is the greatest military power in the world. Without any such need as makes a great fleet imperatively necessary to ensure the safety and even the existence of the British Empire, she has built up in ships, personnel, dockyards and all other essentials, a powerful navy designed to challenge conclusions with that of Great Britain. What ambitions would not be open to Germany, what tribute could she not exact, if dominating Europe with her army she could wage a successful naval campaign against Britain.

Within the past ten years the peace of Europe has been threatened by Germany on no less than three occasions. In 1905 France at her dictation was obliged to dismiss her Foreign Minister. In 1909 Germany shook her mailed fist and compelled Russia to bow to her will. In 1911, as the history of the Agadir incident recalls, she again attempted to coerce and humiliate France, and the situation was saved only by the interposition of Great Britain. Germany receded on that occasion from her first pretensions but only to abide her time which came in 1914.

The military autocracy of Germany have taught their people for more than twenty years that the British Empire stood chiefly in the path of German expansion and that war was inevitable. No one could predict the exact occasion which would be seized, but no one could doubt the intention of the Prussian militarists. There was the lesson of Denmark and Austria and France. In the end the storm broke suddenly and the country was confronted with responsibilities greater than those which it had ever faced. The situation demanded action; it demanded immediate and unhesitating action beyond the authorization of the law as it then stood; it was impossible for the Government to wait; and by Order-in-Council we promulgated necessary measures in advance of the meeting of Parliament. The people of Canada loyally acquiesced in these measures and our course has been ratified by the necessary legislative sanction.

What did we do, and what was our duty? I came back to Ottawa on the first day of August, three days before the war broke out. I had the honor of sending a telegram, at first secret, since made public, telling Great Britain we would co-operate in every endeavor for maintaining the peace of the Empire and of the world (applause), but that if war did un-

fortunately come, the Dominion of Canada stood with Great Britain and all the Dominions of the Empire, to see that the war should be forced to an honorable and victorious conclusion. (Cheers and applause.) And as I said to the officers and men this morning, I am glad to have lived to see the day when the public spirit, the national spirit of Canada, has manifested itself as it has manifested itself in the past four months, and will continue to manifest itself until the issue to which I alluded shall be brought about. (Applause.)

On the first of August I sent to the British Government another secret telegram announcing Canada's desire to send an expeditionary force if war should ensue. The offer was not accepted until the 6th of August, but in the meantime steps in anticipation were taken and the raising and equipment of troops for such a force was authorized. On the 7th August, the suggested composition of the force was received from the British authorities, and was immediately sanctioned by Order-in-Council. Recruiting in the meantime had already commenced, and on the 6th August the preparation of the Valcartier Camp was begun. I visited that Camp for weeks from the day on which work commenced, and I am proud that we possess in Canada the ability to achieve within so limited a period all that was accomplished within that month. A rifle range comprising a line of 1,500 targets and extending more than three and a half miles was completed within about ten days. A complete water supply with necessary piping, pumps, tanks and chlorinating plant with about 200 taps fitted to ablution tables and seventy-five shower baths was constructed. An electric light, power and telephone system was installed. Streets were constructed; buildings and tents erected and an effective sewerage system comprising over 28,000 feet of drain pipe was completed. Railway sidings with necessary loading platforms were constructed. Woods were cleared and elaborate sanitary arrangements prepared. Six large buildings for ordnance stores and for the Army Service Corps, buildings for medical stores, for pay and transport offices, hospital stables for sick horses, fumigating and other buildings were constructed and made ready for use within the same period. Thirty-five thousand men were assembled and put through a most systematic course of training in all branches of the service. Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers, Army Service Corps, Army Medical Corps, Signallers and Ammunition columns were organized, and all were trained in their respective duties. Sixteen thousand men were trained daily in musketry. The clothing and equipment, the transport and supply for 35,000 men

were a heavy undertaking especially in the urgency of haste. It is difficult for those who did not see the camp and who have not studied all that has been accomplished to realize the tremendous demands made upon the organizing ability of the Canadian people to accomplish all this. I venture the assertion that the organization and arrangements of Vancartier Camp have not been excelled in any part of our Empire since the commencement of this war. It is unnecessary to describe in detail all the equipment, arms, accoutrements and other necessities furnished. To equip the force sent forward and to make some provision for future contingents 290,000 pairs of boots and shoes have been provided; 100,000 forage caps, 90,000 great coats, 240,000 jackets and sweaters of various types, 235,000 pairs of trousers, 70,000 rifles, 70,000 bayonets, 80,000 oil bottles, 70,000 water bottles, 95,000 sets of valise equipment and so on in like proportion over a list of sixty-six different articles. With the first expeditionary force we sent to Great Britain 21 thirteen-pounder quick-firing guns, 96 eighteen-pounder quick-firing guns, 10 breach-loading sixty pounder guns, a large number of machine guns, motor lorries, transport wagons and vast quantities of ammunition. The force was ready for embarkation within six weeks from the outbreak of war and could have been then despatched if arrangements for escort had been immediately possible. You, perhaps, do not realize how great an undertaking it was for a non-military country to assemble, organize, train, equip and despatch so large a force within that brief period. It is, I believe, the largest military force that ever crossed the Atlantic at one time. In the great Armada, which threatened the shores of Great Britain three centuries ago, there were less than 20,000 soldiers. The force which we have sent across the Atlantic is nearly fifty per cent. greater than the total number of British troops under Wellington's command at Waterloo.

Let me say in passing, that having seen the arrangements which have been made in Toronto for the training of men and sending them to the front, I am delighted with all that has been done, and I take this opportunity publicly to congratulate General Lessard and his staff and all who have helped him (loud cheers and long applause) for the splendid work done in that regard. I took the opportunity to say this morning, and you will permit me to repeat it here, that the men who are making themselves ready for the stern work which they may be called upon to do later on are serving their country and serving the Empire just as truly as if they were at the front to-day. (Applause.)

Earnest men, with whose ideals I most deeply sympathize, from all over Canada, have been asking me, "Why did we not send immediately one hundred thousand men across the Atlantic? why not send 150,000 or 200,000 men?" Do you realize what it would mean to send men untrained to fight against the most highly trained troops in the world? I would not be responsible for it, if all the people in Canada told me to do it! (Hear, hear, and applause.)

It would be not only useless, but unjust and cruel as well, to send untrained men to the front against highly trained and seasoned troops. They must also be hardened by exercise in the duties of a soldier's life until their physical condition will enable them to endure the hardships of active service. Thus our troops are receiving in Great Britain the same tests of training and of exercises which are prescribed for the volunteer army of the Mother Country. That they will acquit themselves worthily no one can doubt who saw them at Valcartier. In physique, in spirit, in courage, and in all qualities that are necessary for the soldier they will be found second to none.

If the training of soldiers is important, the training, the skill, and the experience of the men who command them are even more essential and imperative. The officers of the Canadian Militia have all the necessary qualities that could be desired. They have given ungrudgingly of their time and their energy to fit themselves as far as possible for the duties of active service. But for them even more than for the men the training and experience at Valcartier and on Salisbury Plain are not only invaluable but absolutely essential before they lead their men into action. In this grim struggle our forces will face the most highly organized military machine in the world.

I have spoken of the training of the men. I am afraid— (Cries of "Go on!")

The Mayor: "We've got all afternoon!"

Sir Robert, continuing: I am afraid the Mayor is impressed with the idea that I intend to make a House of Commons speech. (Laughter.) I have spoken of the training of the men. You know, as I said to the officers this morning, you might as well send a dozen or fifteen men from the street against a professional football club or lacrosse or hockey club, and expect them to succeed, as to send untrained soldiers against highly organized troops.

Now, I know that in the South African war men went perhaps without a great deal of training; but, without professing to understand military affairs as many men here under-

stand them, I think the conditions which have to be faced in this war are very different. (Hear, hear.) I say that with all deference to the opinion of men who are better qualified to judge. With reference to the Civil War in the nation to the south of us, men on both sides learned by experience on the field how to fight and to perform their duties as soldiers. But it would be too costly now to think of sending our men to learn their duties in that way. (Hear, hear.)

I have spoken of what Canada has done. The call of duty has not fallen upon unheeding ears in this country. East and West, every Province and practically every community has responded with an ardor and spirit which emphasizes the strength of the ties that bind together the Dominions of this Empire. When the first contingent sailed from Canada we immediately announced that another would follow. During the delay which ensued before the War Office in the pressure of multitudinous affairs could suggest its composition, it was announced that in addition to the force which had gone abroad and in addition to 8,000 men engaged in garrison and outpost duty, we would enlist and train 30,000 men; and that from these a second contingent would be despatched as soon as the necessary arms and equipment could be provided, and as soon as the War Office would be prepared to receive them. The number under training has recently been increased to 50,000 men, and it is arranged that as soon as each contingent goes forward a corresponding number of men will be enlisted to take its place. This will proceed regularly and continuously until peace is achieved or until we are satisfied that no more men are needed. Our forces under arms in Canada and abroad will soon exceed 100,000 men. That number has frequently been mentioned in the press. In this war which we are waging against the most powerful military organization the world ever knew, I prefer to name no figure. If the preservation of our Empire demands twice or thrice that number, we shall ask for them and I know that Canada will answer the call. But remember that men cannot be sent forward more rapidly than the British authorities are prepared to receive them and to undertake their final training. Moreover, we have not in Canada, as in countries organized on a military basis, great scores of equipment, arms, accoutrements, ammunition and guns. These must be provided, and they are being provided with all possible expedition. Both here and in Great Britain those requisites are lacking upon the tremendous scale which is now necessary. Without thorough training, without arms, equipment and all the essentials of war-

like preparation men sent into this awful maelstrom of war are but an incubus and danger rather than an aid.

There can be but one issue to this war but do not expect that it will be a speedy issue. I have reason to know that the results hitherto attained have been all that were anticipated by the Allies; but so far as can be foreseen, there is a long struggle before us.

The justice of the Allies' cause is generally understood and recognized among our kinsmen in the great neighboring nation, and we are proud of their sympathy. A representative of the German Government in that country has recently thought it necessary to discuss the Monroe Doctrine as it may affect Canada. That doctrine, as you know, does not embody any principle of International law but is a policy proclaimed nearly one hundred years ago by the Government of the United States. For the reason that it is a policy of the United States that country alone has the right to determine its scope and its limitations. As the policy of a great friendly nation the Monroe Doctrine is entitled to every respect, but Canada does not seek shelter behind it in this war. The people of this Dominion are eager and determined to take their part in a struggle which involves the destiny of their Empire, and, indeed, its very existence. They are quite prepared and willing to assume all responsibilities which that action involves, and they have a reasonable confidence in Canada's ability to defend her territory.

Four months of war have elapsed and Canada emerges triumphant from this great test of her unity, her patriotism and her national spirit. It has brought together in co-operation and mutual helpfulness divergent interests, differing beliefs and dissonant ideals. Every Province, every city, town and village, and indeed, every community, has contributed its quota to the magnificent Patriotic Fund, which has been raised to make just provision for those dependent upon the men who have gone to the front. Let us not forget a tribute to the patriotism and generosity of our citizens of German descent, who in proportion to their numbers and their means have made so splendid a contribution to that fund. The women of Canada have provided a great hospital, and all Canada is grateful for their untiring activities in the many missions of mercy which they have undertaken. From the Dominion, from every Province, from cities and towns, from associations of farmers, from the great labor interests of the country and from individuals, aid has come in a generous stream; and you will permit me to say that nowhere in the Dominion has the spirit of patriotism made itself more mani-

fest in generous and effective aid for all purposes than in your own city.

I was reading not long ago General Bernhardi's book, in a translation which appeared in 1913. Speaking of the Dominions of the British Empire he said, "They can be completely ignored so far as concerns any European theatre of war." I want to make this prophecy, that if this war continues as long as we have reason to anticipate at the present moment, the military authorities of Germany will find within that European theatre not less than 250,000 or 300,000 of the best troops in the world from those same negligible Dominions! (Applause.)

For this war has demonstrated the essential unity of the Empire. When the book is closed and the story has been told, we shall at least owe that to the Kaiser. It was to fall asunder as soon as he girded on his shining armor. I sincerely believe the German people did believe the British race was decadent, that this Empire was a sham and deserved to be destroyed, that this Colossus with feet of clay only needed to be attacked to fall prone at their feet. Do the fields of Belgium and France tell you the British race is decadent? The history of the British arms contains no annals more glorious. I have every confidence and belief that the record of Canada will be as worthy as that of the British Isles.

Again, the Empire was to fall apart; India was to revolt; the self-governing Dominions were to stand aside; Ireland was to go into rebellion. But instead, the whole Empire has become tense with unity and instinct, with life and action. That is the answer Canada and the Empire have given to the Kaiser. And that is the answer which they will give him to the end! (Applause.)

In the bitterness of this struggle let us not forget that the world owes much to German thought, endeavor and achievement in science, literature, the arts and every other sphere of useful human activity. I do not doubt that the German people misled as to the supposed designs of Great Britain, impressed for the time being by the Prussian military spirit, and not truly comprehending the real causes of the conflict, are behind their Government in this war. Nevertheless, it is in truth a war waged against the military oligarchy which controls the Government of Germany. The defeat of that military autocracy means much for the world, but it means even more for Germany herself. Freed from its dominance and inspired by truer ideals, the German people will attain a higher national greatness than before.

Let me allude to the German people in our own Dominion. I would like to pay a tribute to what has been done in Canada

by Canadian citizens of German descent. (Applause.) I remember the Mayor of a city in the western part of Ontario, a city whose population is almost altogether composed of citizens of German descent, coming to me in Ottawa and saying that their purpose was to make a contribution in that city to the Patriotic Fund greater per capita than that of any other city in Canada. They have accomplished, or nearly accomplished, what was proposed at that time. (Applause.) And as far as concerns those who have been brought to this country upon the invitation of the people of Canada and the Government, Germans and Austrians who have come to make this country their home, I desire to say, that I have been very closely in touch with them, and they have given every satisfaction; with very few exceptions their conduct has been exemplary and all that could be desired. They will make good citizens of Canada, they and their children. I am sure we realize the trying situation in which they must be placed. One of them was telling me how he almost got into a fight with a neighbor over the question, and he said to his neighbor, "I know I am wrong; forgive me; but there is something in my heart—I have tried to get it out, and I can't get it out." You appreciate what that feeling would be for a man whose relatives are still natives and citizens of Germany or Austria. So I think we owe to these people consideration and fairness. (Hear, hear.)

Canada is united in the strong conviction that our cause is just and in an unflinching determination to make it triumphant. This appalling conflict was not of Britain's seeking. Having entered upon it there is but one duty, to stand firmly united in an inflexible resolve to force it to a victorious and honorable conclusion. Reverses may come but they must only inspire us with a deeper courage and greater determination. Our fortitude and our endurance must equal all demands that the future shall make upon us. All that our fathers fought for and achieved; all that we have inherited and accomplished, our institutions and liberties, our destiny as a nation, the existence of our Empire, all are at stake in this contest. The resolution, the determination, the self-reliance which never failed Canada in the stress and trials of the past will assuredly not fail her now. (Long and hearty applause.)

(December 7, 1914.)

The Ideals of Trade Unionism and the Attitude of Trade Unionism on the War

BY MR. JAMES M. LYNCH.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club, held on the 7th December, Mr. James M. Lynch said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I regret very much that I am late to-day, but it was entirely unavoidable on my part. I think that in the past sixteen years I have traveled nearly one million miles throughout the North American continent, but I never experienced such difficulty in getting to a place as I have had in reaching Toronto. (Laughter.) I was misinformed as to the time my train left Buffalo this morning, and the train I came on was late. If I had known my good friend Jimmy Simpson was here to speak I should have had no worriment at all, because I am sure that if I had not reached here till 4 o'clock he could have entertained you. (Laughter.)

I very seldom in all my career have prepared a speech, and of course have very seldom read a speech, but formerly I was in a position where if I was misquoted it did not matter, I could have denied it. (Laughter.) But being now in a political position, it makes a difference, and I prefer that what I say should be very correct, especially on the subject assigned me.

A year ago, I was asked to speak to you on the subject of trade unionism, and when your Secretary, Mr. Brown, was writing in renewal of that invitation recently, he asked me to add a touch of the war. Now, you know, there is not much of the war spirit about me (laughter), so I can not add much of a touch of the war. I am sure my friends, the publishers here, will agree that I am a peaceable man. (Laughter.)

*Mr. James M. Lynch was President of the International Typographical Union for many years, discharging the duties of that position with great ability and diplomacy. He recently accepted the position of Labor Commissioner of the State of New York, and is recognized all over the continent as one of the ablest leaders in the ranks of organized labor.

Unorganized wage earners, except as they may individually express themselves, cannot make known their views on any subject. No employer can speak for his employees. He may express his opinion of what they think, but it is only his opinion. The one reliable means of expression for the toiler is that which is free and unrestrained. The trade union meeting is his freest forum. There views and opinions are crystallized which later find concrete expression in State and international conventions of great trade unions, and in turn these convention expressions on subjects of international trade union concern are given final form and promulgation at the conventions of the American Federation of Labor. It is fair to assume that the ideals and aspirations of more than two million organized toilers, as given expression by their chosen representatives in these conventions, are also the ideals and aspirations of their unorganized fellows, except that the opportunity for conference and counsel may beget more conservative and seasoned conclusions than are engendered by unexpressed emotions and unredressed wrongs.

Therefore, in what I have to say to-day, when I mention trades unionism I am expressing opinions which I believe from my experience are held by the great majority of toilers, organized and unorganized.

As the expounder of this faith, I wish to acknowledge my personal adherence to the doctrine and my affirmative bias in relation thereto, at the same time asserting that I hold no brief for the labor unions. It is true that for nearly twenty years I was connected with the labor movement in an official way, and that I am still an active member of a typographical union, but in what I have to say to-day I trust that so far as it may be possible for one who acknowledges his bias in advance, I may strip myself of the imagery of an advocate, and set forth plain and unadorned facts. That some of the trade unions and some members of these unions at times are unwise and intolerant is freely admitted, but it is asserted that when the strength and membership of the unions are also given consideration there is less tyranny and injustice chargeable to trades unionism than to any organized effort of our time.

Trade unions have been with us in an active way, pressing for consideration and attention, for more than half a century. The movement is as yet little understood by the great mass of the citizenship of this continent. If I were to define in a sentence the ideal of the trade unionist, I should say that it was best expressed by his determination to secure a higher

standard of living for himself and a brighter future for his children.

Three features of the policy of the North American Trade Union movement are the objects of especial criticism and much misrepresentation: the closed shop, the boycott and the limitation of apprentices. It is well understood that as a rule we must pay for what we get in this world, and so the trade unionists contribute of their earnings in order that they may secure better wages and better conditions. Their position is that it is not to be expected that they will look with consideration and love on men who are entirely willing, nay eager, to accept the benefits that flow from organized effort without in any way assuming its financial burdens and other responsibilities. I am aware that in behalf of these so-called independents, their rights and liberties are oftentimes pleaded, but in a somewhat extensive experience it has been my observation that selfishness rather than a desire to conserve independence has been at the bottom of the refusal to affiliate with the unions. Aside from this, there is the greater and sounder reason why the Unions in this day of collective bargaining insist on the so-called closed, but in the union lexicon, union shop. Contracts provide certain obligations for the employer and the union. If the union controls all of the employees in a contract office then the union is in a position to live up to the contract fully and completely, and it may with certainty guarantee to do this only in a union office. I know this, for the International Typographical Union renews thousands of contracts each year and negotiates hundreds of new contracts. This organization does not recognize non-union or open offices. It learned from bitter and costly experience that if it was to negotiate and maintain contracts, if it was to continue its system of collective bargaining, then it could do so only in those instances in which all of the composing room employees were members of the Typographical Union and all of the mailers members of the mailers' union. I know that the system under which this union operates is satisfactory to the bulk of the employers with whom it has contracts. There are disagreements as to hours and wages, but these are adjusted by arbitration. This great union, with seventy thousand members, has business relations with fifteen thousand union offices. Certainly no one can claim that the union office policy has in any way disastrously affected the printing industry, for it is one of the leading and most prosperous on the continent. When you hear the cry for individual liberty coupled with the demand for the open shop, you will find if you dig deep enough that behind it all is the determination that the employees shall

not organize and that union labor shall not be employed. I assert that candor and honesty recognize only two kinds of industrial union policy, absolute and complete opposition, or the union shop.

Has the trade unionist the right to refuse to patronize a certain merchant? Has he the right to ask his friends to refuse to patronize that merchant? That is the boycott. If the answer is in the negative, he maintains that it is also illegal to ask him to patronize that merchant. He asserts that the right to bestow his patronage, to spend his money where he will, is without limitation, so long as the object is moral, and he proclaims that he not only has the right to withhold, but that he has the right to persuade others to withhold. He maintains that it is a fact that the labor union boycott is the only movement of the kind that has been made the object of court action, for the religious boycott, the social boycott and the racial boycott have all been practiced for hundreds of years, and are to-day in operation, inspired by malice, conceived in hate, practiced in secret, not one of them with justification, while the trade union boycott is at least humanitarian in that its object is to secure a higher standard of living for the men and women who in the sweat of their brows earn their bread.

In recent years industry has undergone a tremendous change. Rules that were necessary a decade ago are archaic to-day. Trades are no longer exclusive to the shop in their mastery by the apprentice. More and more the technical schools are assuming this function. This transfer of industrial training to the schools will continue until the students will be graduated not only mentally trained, but manually trained, fit to enter the industries, and there as skilled artisans gain a livelihood. And in this development the children of the toilers will be the greatest gainers, for they are the most numerous and their necessities will harmonize with the opportunities. Limitation of the number of apprentices was and still is necessary in order that the trades may not be overcrowded, but that limitation must go before the march of progress. In the end the unions will welcome it, for it will mean shorter and still shorter days of labor. There can be no justification for the ten, twelve, or even the eight hour day, if it is not scientifically correct, for the day of toil should be only of sufficient length to meet the needs of industry, and must surely if slowly give way to the day of physical relaxation and mental recreation. Work, yes, but not all the hours in the bondage of the wage. If the schools are to turn out carpenters, printers, cigar-makers, metal workers, without limita-

tion as to number or present necessity, and they will, then society must demand that sustaining employment shall be found for the recruits to the skilled vocations, and this opportunity will come only with the new division of the calendar day into periods of toil, recreation, education and rest.

In what I have to say as to the future of industrial training, I do not want to be understood as in any way indorsing the attempts that have been made at the industrial exploitation of our boys and girls. I am against the training of specialists for industry, the tying of a worker to a machine, teaching the student only one operation in the process of manufacture of any article or any trade, and making him entirely dependent for a livelihood on his limited manual training.

I may interject here, that since I have held the position I now occupy, I have visited the city of Chicago, and in going over that city's factories, seeing thousands of workers tied to special machines, performing one thing over and over again, day in and day out, I have been more than ever convinced that the specialization of workers in that way must be done away with. I can't understand how any individual with brain power or power of fitting himself for any work in life at all, can continue to press a little piece of steel into a machine; there is no relaxation, and no energy needed, in that work.

The schools must teach the student as much as they can teach, and couple that training with actual shop practice, so that when the boy or girl is ready for industry, he or she will in fact have a trade, all that can be taught of that trade, so that the finishing touches will be given by actual shop experience. It is a wicked thing to make of any human being a part of a machine, compelled to do one simple thing from morn until night, atrophied in motion and paralyzed in intellect, as much a part of a machine as though made of its component steel, tied to one employer, worse than a common laborer. (Applause.)

It is true that the fundamental objects for which the trade unions are organized are the increase of wages, the shortening of hours, improvement of the conditions of labor, in brief, to secure a higher standard of living. The industrial conflicts which at times are severe and attract local, State and even national attention centre around these fundamental demands of the workers for a larger share of the product of their toil. That the workers have secured greater benefits in these directions through their organizations is undeniable. Furthermore, general recognition has been won not only of the right but of the desirability of such organization. The principle of collective bargaining no longer encounters effec-

tive opposition. The increasing recognition which labor organizations have secured has been due in large part to the campaign of education by which they have convinced the general public of the rightfulness of their demands. Coincident with this education of the general public, there has been wrought out a saner leadership, the adoption of sounder policies and more rational methods of procedure on the part of the workers themselves.

But of this class of benefits which have been procured, it is not my sole purpose to speak, but also of what may perhaps be called a by-product of labor organization, namely, beneficiary features which have been developed as a protection against loss of earning power by death, disability, and the vicissitudes of unemployment.

The death benefit is the most general of all benefits. All national unions which pay benefits of any kind pay death benefits. The absence of death benefits in such national unions as do not pay them is generally due to the fact that the local of such unions have well established local death benefits, and even in some unions which have a national benefit this is supplemented by the locals. The reasons for the more general adoption of the death benefit than any other are obvious. It is most needed in order to sustain the dependents who are left, and at a time when money is a dire necessity; it is also least open to fraud, since the fact of death is generally easily established, and the administration is comparatively simple.

In some of the unions, the benefit fund is separately organized and an insurance policy issued, as for example the Mutual Life and Accident Association of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, which is separately organized and carries the death and permanent disability benefits of the Brotherhood. In unions which operate the insurance policy system, participation is in most cases compulsory, but in others the insurance feature is optional with the members. In the majority of cases, however, membership in the union entitles members to the benefits automatically, usually after a minimum period of membership varying from six months to a year. In some cases participation in the full benefit is allowed only to those who are below a fixed age and pass a medical examination. Provision may be made for partial participation by those who are debarred by the age limit or the medical examination. The practice of some unions of paying an increased amount of benefit according to the length of continuous membership has been found of value in attracting and holding members, entirely aside from the added insurance in its commercial aspect. Provision is usually made for forfeiture of

the benefit if death is caused by intemperance or immoral conduct. In addition to the benefit paid on the death of a member, a number of unions also pay a death benefit on the death of a member's wife.

Next in importance to the death benefits as measured by the amounts reported come the sickness and temporary disability benefits. Although considerable opposition manifested itself to the introduction of this form of benefit by the national unions, it has proved to be a source of strength where adopted, and has become popular with the unions. Many locals pay sick benefits even where their national organization does not have such a feature. The need for assistance during sickness or temporary disability is as obvious as in the case of death, but in practice such assistance is more difficult to administer. The administration of sick benefits is far more generally in the hands of the locals than in the national organizations. The relief needed is immediate and the delay entailed by correspondence with a central organization is a consideration. Accordingly, even in organizations which have adopted national sick benefits the locals have a large share in their administration. The local union by means of its visiting committee can determine the genuineness of the application and prevent imposition upon the treasury. As in the case of death, payment is usually denied when the illness is caused by intemperance or immorality. A single example may be given to illustrate this form of benefit. The Cigar Makers' Union was the first American National Trade Union to grant sick relief. This was in the year 1881. At present any one who has been a member for one year is entitled to five dollars per week for not to exceed thirteen weeks in one year.

I have called attention to the penalties attaching to intemperance and immorality. All international and national unions take this position, and all of them are potent factors in the crusade for a higher code of ethics and morals. (Applause.) In proportion to their numerical strength and influence they are doing as great a work in this connection as is the church.

The unemployment problem, one of the most pressing social problems at the present time, has not lacked attention at the hands of labor organizations, but the very difficulty and complexity of the problem, which have hitherto delayed any general attempt on this continent at its solution, have also affected labor organizations. The almost total lack of reliable estimates of the probable annual cost of such a system is the chief hindrance to its development. Besides, the difficulties of administration are great. Nevertheless, a beginning has

been made. The Cigarmakers' Union has since 1890 paid regularly a weekly benefit to its members who are out of work. The administration has been carefully conducted. The locals pay out the money directly, but are regulated and supervised by the national organization.

The International Typographical Union in 1907 instituted an old age pension of four dollars per week to members who are sixty years of age and are incapacitated for further duty, and later increased the pension to five dollars a week. This union now has some twelve hundred pensioners, and a balance in the pension fund of \$700,000. I have come in personal contact with many of these pensioners, and I know the great good that the pension system has accomplished. Then there is the Union Printers' Home at Colorado Springs, erected and maintained by the International Typographical Union, and now housing 180 residents, half of whom are patients in the tuberculosis sanitarium. Every necessity is furnished free of charge to those domiciled at the Home, including clothing, food and medical attention. And the best of it all is, that the pension and the Homes are not charities. The members pay for them in their years of earning power, and enjoy them as a right in their years of declining health or earning capacity.

I assume that in any assembly of business men, one of the things that attracts attention the quickest would be the enumeration of sums of money, especially large sums of money. So in order to show that in striving to obtain the fruit of his toil, the trade unionist is seeking a higher standard of citizenship and a brighter future for his children, and that it is not all a question of strikes and lockouts and riots in trade unions. I have included some figures, which I think will make an impression.

In 1913, the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor paid out \$1,958,892.83 for death benefits, \$816,336.41 in sick benefits, and \$3,357,222.80 in strike benefits. The foregoing totals are exclusive of \$242,650 spent for old age pensions and \$100,767 for the Union Printers' Home by the International Typographical Union, and \$3,200 by the Wood Carvers and \$2,843 by the Pattern Makers for tool insurance.

The unions not in affiliation with the American Federation, such as the conductors, engineers, firemen, letter carriers, etc., paid \$8,818,931.68 in death benefits, \$1,787,004.38 in sick and disability benefits, and \$3,474,209.51 in strike benefits. Insurance is one of the principal functions of the railway brotherhoods mentioned, because the members cannot get insurance except at prohibitive rates.

In connection with the foregoing, let me show what a few of the larger international unions are doing:

The conductors paid \$1,074,000 in death benefits, and \$61,000 in sick and disability benefits, the engineers \$1,932,272.34 and \$152,406.90, the firemen \$802,862.25 and \$217,750, and the trainmen \$2,410,985.10 in death benefits alone. The bricklayers and masons paid \$242,967.80 in death benefits and \$24,000 in sick benefits, the letter carriers \$340,000 in death benefits, the Brotherhood of Carpenters \$307,069.11 for the same purpose, the Cigarmakers \$273,852.04 in death benefits and \$204,775.61 in sick benefits, the hatters \$65,000 in death benefits, the hotel and restaurant employees \$68,662.40 in death benefits and \$58,911.06 in sick benefits, the painters \$113,125 in death benefits, the street railway employees \$132,300 in death benefits, the switchmen \$181,125 in death benefits, the tailors \$11,883 in death benefits and \$22,099.80 in sick benefits, and the Typographical Union \$234,457.69 in death benefits. These are only a few examples, but they are sufficient to show that the benefit record of the unions is as creditable as is their record in advancing wages and establishing the eight-hour day. It is not all strikes and lockouts, riots and bloodshed, as generally accepted by those who do not investigate and therefore cannot know. (Applause.)

In legislative effort, the record of the unions is one of which they may justly be proud. They have been behind every humanitarian measure, every proposal for the advancement of social justice and every movement the object of which was the diffusion of prosperity and happiness. The labor laws and compensation laws, now on many statute books, are bright particular examples. No longer will the man or woman injured in industry suffer in penury and want. No longer will hard wrung verdicts for money damages find both lawyer and victim the recipients. The Compensation Law of New York State is also one of the greatest humanitarian measures of our time. The confusion and misrepresentation by which it was designedly surrounded by its opponents are nearly dispelled, and with the passage of each day its value stands forth with greater clearness and its equity with more pronounced emphasis.

Safe and sanitary mills, mines and mercantile establishments form the keynote of our labor laws, which are in turn meeting with a great measure of public approval as they become better understood. The labor laws and the compensation law will find their greatest usefulness in the prevention of accidents, which after all is the finer thing and of the deepest concern to society. Industry should not be permitted its

annual toll of thousands killed and more thousands and thousands injured.

And now, the toilers and war. (Hear, hear.) I presume that just at this time the greatest interest is felt by this audience in the attitude of the trade unionist toward war. In numbers of the conventions of representative trade unions and in many of the conventions of the American Federation of Labor resolutions have been adopted protesting against war, against mighty standing armies and tremendous navies, and for the disarmament of nations (hear, hear); but at the same time, to my knowledge, there has been no demand that any particular nation should disarm or without like co-operation from other nations weaken its military power, for the trade unionist realizes that national defense and national preparedness are among a nation's first duties, and that universal disarmament and permanent peace are matters for world agreement and not the affairs of individual nations, except as they may be considered at the parliament of nations. So far as the trade unionist is concerned, I might best illustrate this view by pointing to the enrolment of thousands of trade unionists in Great Britain. Officers of the British trade movement recently in the United States told me that the ranks of their unions had been greatly decimated through enlistment. This is also true in France and in Germany, and I cite it to show that whenever his nation's life and existence are at stake the trade unionist is a patriot in common with his fellow man. (Hear, hear.) He may not be the less opposed to war and to mighty armies and mighty navies, but he can reserve his protest until his nation emerges from the clouds of peril and attack, and then once more through his trade unions and his conventions plead for universal peace coupled with universal disarmament. I am of the opinion, therefore, that the trades unionist's attitude toward war is akin to that of his fellow citizens. He is against wars of oppression and conquest. He is for his country when its national integrity and continued well-being are threatened. His prayer is that God may speed the day when universal peace may be a permanent, sound and stable reality. (Applause.)

My friends, a nation's life, its prosperity and its future are largely bound up with the welfare of its industrial and agricultural population. We may profit much by studying the organized movements, aspirations and ideals of each of these classes, and I trust that so far as the industrial unions of the wage earners are concerned, I have said enough in the few moments at my disposal to stimulate your interest and spur

your zeal to further investigation, in order that hereafter your criticism of the trades unions may be based on a thorough understanding of their efforts, their achievements and their policies, so that it may be helpful in lifting to a higher plane those who are struggling for a wider field of usefulness and a greater breadth of life, and in doing this help in making a greater citizenship and a greater nation. (Applause.)

(December 14, 1914.)

War—The Neglected Factor in Canadian Problems for a Hundred Years

BY LIEUTENANT-COLONEL WILLIAM WOOD.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club, held on the 14th of December, Lieutenant-Colonel William Wood said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—First, sir, let me thank you for the kind—or, perhaps I should say, the very indulgent—way in which you have introduced me to this meeting. I consider it, as I am sure all other speakers have considered it, a special honor to address the Canadian Club in Toronto; for though there are now many Canadian Clubs there can never be but one which is first among its peers by right of prior foundation. In using the word peers I make a supposition, not a statement; for I am naturally bound to profess an ignorance on this point which exceeds even that which I don't invariably confess on many others. (Laughter.) One distinction, however, I will make bold to draw from—shall I say?—the Derby. There are many races but only one Derby. And just as it is something for a horse to have been an "also ran" in that particular race on Epsom Downs so it is something for a speaker to have been an "also ran" before this audience in Toronto. (Laughter.)

Away back in the tranquil part of last July your Secretary and I had arranged that I should speak on man and beast and life afloat along the Canadian Labrador. But when circumstances changed my subject changed with them. From a subject connected with my recreation I turned to one connected with my work. For many years past I have been investigating the naval and military history of Canada directly from original sources. I have also made a special study of the problems of defence to-day. And so, simply by force of circumstances, and not from any merit of my own, I happen to be in touch

* Lieutenant-Colonel Wm. Wood of Quebec is one of the most active writers and investigators in the field of Canadian history. He is also widely known as an authority on outdoor life in Canada. His books on Canadian history are widely read.

with the main factor of the problem now before us. Pray let me repeat the word factor. The full influence of this factor on our immensely complex problems is something for wiser heads than mine. All I attempt here is to show, from undeniable data, that we have failed to reckon with it for a hundred years and that our present naval and military shortcomings are the inevitable result of our own neglect.

Might I venture to intrude a personal word of explanation, to say that I approach this burning question not as a critical outsider but as a Canadian through and through? I propose to tell the disconcerting truth with a plainness of speech which would be impossible for a professional soldier, for an Old-Countryman, or, perhaps, for a man who had no French blood in his veins. And, gentlemen, I think you will acquit me of personal prejudice in the selection and presentation of my facts when I tell you that, far from being a professional soldier or sailor, I am a professional author and a Canadian ex-militiaman; that, far from being an Old-Countryman, I am Canadian-born, of the third generation, and with half my blood entirely foreign—one-quarter Yankee and one-quarter French; and that, in all questions of defence, I don't care one snap for any kind of party politics. (Laughter and cheers.)

"War! the Neglected Factor in Canadian Problems for a Hundred Years." The neglect of it is my proper theme to-day. But we Canadians have grown so unaccustomed to think about the nature of it that we might begin by reminding ourselves of those elementary things which have always made war a great determining factor in the world. We might go on to discriminate between warriors and war, and learn that warriors are to war as doctors to disease.

War is part of that natural struggle for existence and for a favoring environment which not only goes back to the very origin of life but persists to the present day among all successive forms of it, from the single plant or animal to the greatest empires and republics of the human race. No immemorial and universal factor which is still in operation is likely to come to a full stop within one short human generation. Yet we went on as if this stop was coming, though the greatest war the world has ever seen was being brought about by a certain specific natural cause which has never once failed to bring war in the past. The Germans, newly formed into a powerful empire, and growing fast in population, wealth, ambition, and the natural desire for a favoring environment, could hardly be expected to resign themselves to an ever-dwindling future by remaining pent up within the narrow limits of their European lands. They had no place in the

whole wide world, outside of their own narrow country, where they could bring up German children under the German flag. The Russian and British Empires, on the other hand, have enormous lands for whites to grow in. The Russians still seek the sea instinctively, as any one can observe by watching the centre of gravity of their population moving steadily south to the sea and the sun, for generation after generation. The British have land, sea, and sun, all together. The Germans have narrow lands and narrow seas at home, with no "place in the sun" elsewhere. Now, there is no instance known to history in which such different conditions have long existed side by side without a war. The war simply had to come, sooner or later. Fortunately for us the Germans have forced it on us with a sheer stupidity of statecraft that is enough to make Bismarck turn in his grave, as well as with a fiendishness of action that has put them beyond the pale of civilized respect. If they had been less stupid and more humane our own case might well have been much worse than it is. Say what we will, our Empire is the greatest of all barriers to German growth—and no living thing on earth has ever yet been stunted by a rival without a fight.

Does this inevitable rivalry make us wrong? Not at all. We have grown as the Germans wish to grow, and we must be judged, not by our mere growth in itself, any more than they should be by theirs, but rather by the use we make of it. We, like them, are body, soul, and spirit in our imperial life. We both have religion and morality to reckon with. We both were born a natural body. We both should strive towards being raised a spiritual body. We both live in one eternal flux between co-operation and competition. And, the world being what it is, we both have a perfect right to be as patriotic as we choose. Only, patriotism ought to be the most nearly perfect blend of the national body, soul, and spirit—that is, of the struggle for existence touched to higher ends by religion and morality—and the Germans do not regard the higher ends in their attacks; while we do in our defence. (Loud applause.)

The best nations have always been the most patriotic; and a patriot nation must always draw the sword whenever its honor is involved, as our Empire's honor is in maintaining Belgian independence. (Loud applause.) Force in itself is a neutral thing. Only the use to which man puts it makes it right or wrong. And we, of late, in this New World, have been so attentive to certain pacifistic sophistries that we sometimes forget that those who fail to use force in the service of right are, of necessity, by their mere abstention, sharing the sin of

those who use it in the service of wrong. (Loud applause.) We were becoming apt to think that this New World was a particularly righteous place, and that we, of course, were a particularly righteous people, because we had no great standing armies and no great recent wars. But we forgot that this imaginary righteousness came simply from several cogent facts; that there was still plenty of room to grow in the New World, that this room was won by war, that every New World state has been involved in war repeatedly, in spite of having room to grow, and that the two Americas have no great standing armies simply because they are not at present within the area of intensest competition. You can't make morality out of mere geography. (Hear, hear.)

Yes, any way we put it, the best nations are the patriotic nations (loud applause), those who neither exaggerate the factor of war in the world's problems nor yet neglect it, but simply face it bravely and well (loud applause), not like the bully, to whom force is a god, nor like the pacifist, to whom force is a devil, but like all greatest men to whom force is an instrument of right or wrong. (Loud applause.) And if this be true of nations, what praise can be too high for the actual defenders of a righteous cause, for men whose discipline is founded on self-sacrifice, whose training makes them fittest for the service of the rest, and whose whole ideal exalts the profession of arms—body, soul, and spirit—into a true vocation of unsurpassable nobility. (Loud applause.) Those who would wrest Holy Writ to our country's sure destruction forget, with singular convenience, that Christ Himself used force to scourge the temple money lenders and overthrow their tables, and that neither He nor His disciples ever condemned the soldier for being a soldier—quite the contrary. They also most conveniently forget that all civilized justice rests on a foundation of force, and that criminals would defy it if it was not enforced by the police, behind whom stand the army, navy, and militia. Moreover, they forget that the greater arts have never flourished in any nation that was not great in arms, and that the trite quotation, "the pen is mightier than the sword," seeks to establish an opposition which does not exist in fact. It would be far truer to say that mighty pens praise righteous swords (loud applause), as Wordsworth's "Happy Warrior" has shown so excellently well. (Hear, hear.) Take the eight chief literatures, those of the Hebrews, of Greece, Rome, Italy, England, Spain, France, Germany; choose out their very greatest writers, with whom we New World people have no one to compare—the authors of the Bible, Homer, Virgil, Dante, Shakespeare, Cervantes, Molière, Goethe—and

you will find no single word in contradiction of the convincing and exalting truth that mighty pens praise righteous swords. (Loud applause.)

And now, gentlemen, let us leave the consideration of war in general for its particular application as the neglected factor in our Canadian problems for a hundred years. I choose this precise lapse of time because it is only during the last hundred years that war has been a really Canadian problem at all. Up to the close of the War of 1812 Canada had no wars of her own and she played no Canadian part in wars elsewhere. She was merely an object of contention between French, American, and British rivals.

The final possession of Canada having been settled in a way which is, I believe, more or less satisfactory to Toronto (laughter and applause) an absolutely different war period began with the Canadian Rebellion of 1837 and ended with the North-West Rebellion of 1885. These little wars, like the first Riel Rebellion and the two Fenian Raids, were purely internal and not much more than glorified police work on a national scale. All but the last, moreover, were fought with the help of Imperial forces. The South African war constituted a third period, which was quite as distinct from the second as the second from the first. It meant that Canada was taking her first step, as a self-governing Dominion, on to the scene of Imperial action oversea. A fourth period, completely different from the other three, has now begun with the sending of Canadian contingents to join the other British and allied forces in any part of the belligerent world. Thus, by four successive steps, Canada has grown up, first, from being a mere pawn in the game of war between three great outside powers to, secondly, taking over the management of her own internal wars, thirdly, to playing her part with the rest in the Empire oversea, and, fourthly, to being one of the British belligerents in the Great World War of to-day. (Applause.)

Now, in view of the constant progress which those four steps imply, and of the many acts of patriotic service done, how is it that war must still be called the neglected factor in our problems for a hundred years? Well, to understand how this strange thing can be we must consider something even stranger—our unique position as a self-governing Dominion within an Empire whose Mother Country gives her children the maximum enjoyment of all the freedom that is possible in combination with the absolute minimum of freedom's responsibilities and risks. So far as defence is concerned we could not possibly get more or be obliged to give less. (Applause.)

We Canadians are so free that we ourselves hardly understand how free we are. Our freedom is certainly greater than the average American thinks possible. How many people across the line fully realize that, in this stupendous war, where all things British are at stake, we need not arm one single man except of our own free will? More than this, we could claim, and we would receive, full protection as British subjects everywhere, even if we did not arm one single man at home—let alone our sending contingents to the front. Moreover, we are so free that we could change our destiny to-morrow, if we wished to. And this question of our destiny brings us straight to the point. We can have annexation, independence, or two kinds of British partnership, just as we please. There seems to be only one real objection to annexation, that it means the complete obliteration of Canadian life—the rest are not worth mentioning. (Laughter and applause.) Again, there is one purely practical objection to perfect independence—the difficulty of holding the area of Europe with the population of London in face of a land-hungry world of eighteen hundred million people. (Applause.)

Well, sir, I see that the meeting considers both annexation and independence out of court for the present; so I will deal with the two different kinds of British partnership. (Applause.) Now, which kind of partnership are we to have—that of the patriot or that of the parasite? (Cries of "Patriot.") Or must we compromise between the two. (Shouts of "No!") Well, gentlemen, I quite agree with you. (Hear! hear!) But, at the same time, I am here to lay the—shall I call them "compromising"?—facts before you. On the other hand, let us be fair to ourselves by bearing constantly in mind that no other people in the world has ever been more insidiously tempted to drift down to ultimate destruction with the parasitic stream. With the British Navy on one side and the Monroe Doctrine on the other, we could go on talking for a few years yet. The Monroe Doctrine is a particularly fascinating topic for the parasitic mind. But great, good, and friendly as the United States may be, they are a foreign power and would be perfectly right to refuse protection except on their own terms. How foreign they are now is something we hardly realize. A hundred years ago the British and the Americans were nearly of the same blood. Now they are not. More than half of all American citizens now have at least one-half or more foreign blood in their veins. And the only foreign blood they have not got is French, which we in Canada have in every member of more than a quarter of our total population.

There's plenty to talk about. But let us confine ourselves to one topic of quite exceptional appeal. Just as the New World congratulates itself that it is not as Old Worlds are, so we Canadians constantly proclaim that we are living the natural life of man in this free land of ours, where the cardinal virtues grow from seed of our own planting, especially virtues of the anti-military type. Then, in sharp, unfavorable contrast, we look, half in pity, half contempt, at the wretchedly artificial life led by the antiquated fossils of naval and military Europe. But the exact, unpleasant, disconcerting, and—I must insist on adding—patriotic truth is quite the reverse of this. It is the European British who are living the natural life, amid the ceaseless struggle for existence; and it is we Canadians who, in this particular question of defence, have been living the sheltered artificial life so long that we have come to take it as the just reward of our anti-military virtues. Of course I do not mean to say that the present audience shares this common view, or even that we, as a whole people, ever consciously give it this precise and antithetical form. But I do maintain that the general idea of it is subconsciously abroad in the popular mind and that many of our public men “voice the sentiments” of many a public meeting in this perverting way when they certainly ought to know better. (Hear, hear.)

Sir, to prevent any misconception, I must beg your leave to say that, though I am dealing only with the question of defence, I am by no means forgetting the many other questions which are held to account for things as they are. The Mother Country has made plenty of mistakes—what country has not? We Canadians find our own histories most exasperating reading whenever they refer to boundary lines—nor is our exasperation to be wondered at so long as our histories continue to be written without full knowledge of the treaties and other circumstances determining the action of the Mother Country. I don't forget the errors of a Colonial Office that has somehow contrived to manage the greatest colonial empire ever known. I very well remember sundry untoward dispatches and all the stings that ingenuity can extract from the private letters of certain public men; also that Disraeli once referred to “our wretched colonies”; also that the young Queen Victoria fell a little short of King Solomon in some of her earlier remarks on Canadian affairs; also that the question has been asked whether so-and-so was a “real” bishop, colonel, or “Honorable,” as the case might be, or “only a colonial what-you-may-call-it”; also that we have no class of Canadians corresponding to the “fool Englishman”; also that Englishmen do

speaking English with an English accent; etc., etc., etc. Moreover, sir, I quite agree that the development of our resources really is a very imperative affair for us, when our population is the same as Greater London's and our area equals that of Europe. And I would be among the last to yield one inch on questions of Canadian rights, Canadian glories, or Canadian love of country. But it is because a truly patriotic audience must always want to see things as they really are that I lay before you certain facts which are not generally known and which are still less generally understood.

Let us take one searching glance at the Navy, another at the Army, a third at our own Militia, and the last at the present war.

First, the Navy. From the day Wolfe fell victorious on the Plains of Abraham to the day when Canada first recognized that naval affairs of any kind were worth at least a debate was exactly a hundred and fifty years. During that time the Americans twice tried to conquer Canada; and they would assuredly have done so if it had not been for British sea-power, which had to face nearly all the naval world in arms on the first occasion, and fight Napoleon as well as the States on the second. During that time there were several foreign wars which would have involved the British Empire if there had been no irresistible British Navy. During that time there actually was a great European war which never spread to the overseas Dominions because of the British Navy. During that time Canada rose to the fourth place among all the shipping countries in the world. And during the whole of that same time Canada neither did anything for her own defence at sea nor gave anything to the Mother Country for it—not a ship, not a dollar, not a man.

I do not wish, sir, even to hint at which naval policy is the right one. There is a good deal to be said on both sides. But I do wish to point out that, among all the self-governing Dominions, Canada is last, and a very long way last, in actual achievement. The real trouble is not that one party or policy is right and the other wrong, but that no effective policy of any kind was ever put in force. Who's to blame? Why, all of us! (Hear, hear.) No party government in a free country can go far beyond the mass-sense of its party. Nor, in the same way, can the Government and Opposition together go far beyond the mass-sense of the whole electorate. And in 1909 the whole electorate were not in earnest, not really interested, not anything like even half-educated on this vital question. That is why our national education on naval defence

has to begin in the middle of a war. That is why we are so lamentably last. Newfoundland gave men, though the Navy paid for them. South Africa gave money. New Zealand contributed a Dreadnought. Australia had a Navy of her own. We, halting between two opinions, behind which there was no compelling national desire, have produced a next-to-nothing navy after five years' talk; while during the hundred and fifty years before, we produced nothing at all—not a ship, not a dollar, not a man.

Secondly, the Army. Let us begin by remembering that British wars are all amphibious, and that the Army and Navy are only two parts of one whole. (Hear, hear.) Let us go on by adding up the sums spent by the Imperial Government on fortifying Canada. They amount to a good deal over five hundred million dollars. A point worth noticing is that at the end of most final reports there is a note saying that the Royal Engineer officer-in-charge takes pleasure in reporting that, owing to economies effected in construction, there would be a saving to the public of so many thousand pounds. These economies were not effected at the expense of efficiency; nor did they mean that Colonel Smith, R.E., would be given a bonus, or praised in the press, as he would have been had he been something in civic, provincial, or Dominion politics. No, it was all in the common day's work for him to be more careful of public money than his own. (Loud applause.)

Do we think quite enough of what the British soldier means to Canada? Of later years we have paid much more attention to his real and supposed defects than to his solid virtues. The "Ha! Ha! Hussars!" are quite too absurd, of course, for this practical New World of ours—that is, till we remember that Sir John French is one of them, and that there are many other Cavalry officers now carrying on, with consummate ability, a "business proposition" requiring more skill, and implying infinitely greater personal self-sacrifice, than is required from many a real, live, hustling, smart Canadian. And here, sir, we might also remember that this hussar, like practically all great fighting men, wields the pen to good effect as well as the sword. A classic instance of the same truth—and one that is apter still for Canada—is furnished by Wolfe. When his dispatches were first published Charles Townshend declared that Wolfe himself could not have written them (a very common form of declaration, made about most great commanders, from Julius Cæsar down). "Of course my brother wrote them. He's in public life at home." But when Wolfe died, and George Townshend's own dispatches were found to be far inferior, a well-known wag went

up to Charles and said, "Look here, Charles, if your brother wrote Wolfe's dispatches who the Devil wrote your brother's?" (Laughter and applause.) Of course, gentlemen, I knew, before I told you this story, that all of you agreed with Thackeray: "Let those civilians who sneer at the acquirements of the Army read Sir Harry Smith's account of the Battle of Aliwal. A noble deed was never told in nobler language." But a point of more concern to us is that most of the Viceroy's throughout the British Empire have been soldiers, and that most of these soldiers have been successful viceroys in peace as well as war. (Hear, hear.) Murray and Carleton are only two out of many more; and the fact that both of these are held in peculiar honor by the French-Canadians to the present day is, in itself, an instructive item from several points of view. Perhaps the mere fact that Murray and Carleton were soldiers appealed to French-Canadian confidence; for the French soldiers had nearly always been conspicuously better men than the civilian officials of New France. Montcalm, for instance, was as different from a guardian of the public purse like Bigot as any Colonel Smith, R.E., from any Canadian counterpart of the notorious Mr. Boodle. (Applause.) Then, again, the French-Canadians had a good deal of soldier blood in their own veins; which reminds us that the early Anglo-Canadians were often soldiers, too, that the U. E. Loyalists were also famous as a fighting stock, and that these three stocks together helped to save the country in the War of 'Twelve. (Applause.)

The fact is, gentlemen, that we owe far more than we commonly recognize to the United Service of the British arms by land and sea. (Applause.) Let us put the debt into dollars. There is the fortification item of five hundred millions to begin with—and I beg to assure you, gentlemen, that I am not giving these figures in any loose general way, but with full warrant from the original expense accounts now in the Dominion Archives. The next item is the Imperial garrison in peace and war. That means a force varying from as low as fifteen hundred to as much as nearly thirty thousand, but with a normal average, for many years, of over five thousand. The third item is the cost of that part of the Navy which more especially guarded Canada in peace and war—though the whole Navy has always been on perpetual guard at all times, a thing we often forget. Taking the same period, from 1759 to 1909, the total cost of all three items together amounts to very much more than two thousand millions. (Loud applause.)

"Well, what of it," say the carping critics, "the Mother Country did it to please herself, and aggrandize her Empire, and get her money back in trade," and so on, and so on. Perhaps she did. (Cries of No!) Perhaps she didn't. It does seem a little strange that the greatest, freest, and most successful Empire the world has ever seen should have been built up by a purely selfish, domineering Mother Country. But what a satisfaction it must be to those who take this view to gloat over the adverse balance still standing against the Mother Country on every item of her long expenditure—men, money, ships, forts, tariffs, and the toll of human lives. However, this is not the point. The point is that we could not be sitting here as Anglo-Canadians to-day, and the French-Canadians could not now be living a French-Canadian life, unless the Mother Country's strong right arm had been protecting us all through. (Loud and continued applause.)

But how about the Canadian Militia? That is something of our very own. (Hear, hear.) Well, this brings us to my third point just when I ought to be at the end of my fourth, and last—the present war: (Cries of "Go on!") but as these two final points are both important I shall go on to give the gist of them. (Applause.)

Our Militia is a force to which all its members ought to be proud to belong, for it has always done as well as the country allowed it to do. (Hear, hear.) I wish I could say that the country, as a whole, took a proper pride in it. I am afraid that I can prove with mathematical exactitude that the country, as a whole, never has taken any really consistent pride in it at all. Remember that, for the last hundred years, the Militia has been the one armed force we have maintained, that the permanent part of it is only a little more than forty years old, that it took thirty years for this permanent force to exceed a single thousand men, and that, even with the very recent addition of the Naval Service, the total regular Army and Navy of Canada has never had an established strength equal to one-tenth of one per cent. of our population. Now let us return to the Active Militia, pure and simple. What, exactly, is the unit of Canadian national effort put forth on behalf of this Militia? The result will, I think, astonish everyone except those who have made such things a study. The average strength of the Militia has generally been about one per cent. of the population, more or less—usually less. That means less than one-twentieth of the able-bodied males within the militia limits of age. The drill period is twelve days; and though it is longer for mounted corps, and though it is lengthened by individual enthusiasts, it is so much shortened,

for all practical purposes, in the case of country corps, by Sundays, by bad weather, and by marching in and out of camp, that the twelve-day average will stand fair. Now, here's the sum. If you train one-twentieth of your manhood for one-thirtieth of the year what national effort do you put forth? The answer is, of course, one-six-hundredth part of the national year's work, which, allowing for Sundays and holidays, comes to one, single, half-time day out of the whole three hundred and sixty-five. (A voice, "That's right," and applause.)

This fact alone is quite enough to explain all the militia shortcomings that are so freely criticized by our general public whenever it is suddenly wakened out of sleep on one of the three hundred and sixty-four non-militia days of our Canadian year. Whose fault is it? Our own. (Applause.) Just as in the other cases mentioned, so here: no government in a free country can go much beyond the electorate, and no public service, however patriotic its individual members may be, can be much better, as a whole, than the electorate allows it to be. The Militia has improved, especially in developing the auxiliary branches of an army. But it is not, and under anything like present conditions it can not, be anything like what it ought to be—an army always in the making. Even an infantry private requires several months of steady training before he is altogether battle-worthy. Then, as the unit becomes more complex—from the individual man to the company, battalion, brigade, and division—the time and trouble of preparation must correspondingly increase. When artillery, cavalry, engineers, aircraft, army service corps, and all the other indispensable parts of a practical army are added in the difficulties naturally go on increasing, too. The greatest difficulty of all is the officers. When we remember that even after a cadet has passed triumphantly through a three-year course at the Royal Military College he still requires further training with whatever corps he joins, we can begin to understand how it is that brigades and divisions—let alone army corps—cannot take the field for a long time if even a part of their officers are untrained. And where is the ordinary militia officer to get his practical training? Even if he passes through the regular courses with flying colors how is he to apply his knowledge, especially if he belongs to a country battalion? Each unit, from a section under a sergeant to an army under a Field Marshal commanding-in-chief, must be organized and trained together as such. No separate parts, however good in themselves, will make such a marvellously interdependent whole as an army is unless they have been put

together with infinite care and worked together with consummate skill. You can't get much more out of your work than you have put into it. And, as a free people, we have been putting no more than half-a-day's work a year into our Militia for three generations past. Now, when the crisis is upon us, we wonder why the men whose business it was didn't do better! But we forget that it is one of the glories and safeguards of freedom that defence is a part of everybody's business, and that the saying, "everybody's business is nobody's business," cannot be applied without disaster.

Nevertheless, whenever we get the chance, instead of setting our own time, money, and—above all—intelligent attention to work, we attack the Militia as if it had suddenly swallowed a double dose of acquired and original sin, and we hug to our bosoms the same old delusions about the untrained patriots who fly to arms and victory together that have been invariably exploded on every possible occasion since the first trained army smashed the first armed mob. Sir, I do not forget the many instances so often cited by way of contradiction—the English yeomen, the American Rangers, and our own Canadian Militia; the Spanish Guerrillas, Garibaldi's Thousand, Hofer's Tyrolese, and the Francs-tireurs; the Bashi-Bazouks, the Boers, and a hundred more. As a matter of fact, every one of these instances tells in favor of discipline and training. The Boers, for example, were highly trained riders, raiders, skirmishers, and rifle shots. But, by the testimony of their own commanders, they failed egregiously in the higher forms of discipline, training, and organization; and they were beaten in consequence. On the other hand, it is commonly forgotten, especially by arm-chair critics, that the British Army has had to fight under a greater variety of conditions than any other force in the world—the British Navy by no means excepted—and nearly always against enemies who were necessarily more accustomed to the peculiar local conditions of each particular campaign. (Hear, hear.)

Let us take a concrete instance from our own Canadian history. There is a general impression that Militiamen of the kind we have in time of peace to-day did wonders at the front on both sides in the War of 1812. Ridiculous as this must appear to the present audience, or to any other composed of men who have their country's real interests at heart, it certainly is a general impression, of the usual baseless, intangible, and dangerously subtle kind. Now, sir, I hope you will forgive me for making one more personal statement. But I should like to say that, after five years' work on the original documents of that war, I am in a position to state positively

that no such militiamen ever affected the issue of a single battle, except, indeed, against their own side; and that no appreciable body of such militiamen ever fought in any battle at all, except on the American side. The Imperial regulars were the best force, all round, on either side, as a complete army. Then, on our side, came the Canadian regulars, six battalions of them. Next to these came the Select Embodied Militia, who were almost the same as regulars, consisting, as they did, either of men continuously under arms or of those who formed a trained reserve after service with the colors. Even the non-select Embodied Militia had often been trained as long as Kitchener's Army before they came under fire; while the Sedentary Militia, very few of whom got near the firing line, had mostly put in more training before and during the war than our peace Militia is allowed to do in a lifetime. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

If you want examples on the other side, take the American naval forces in general first, and then their military forces at Chippawa and Washington. The American Government, like many Canadians now, believed in waiting till the time came and then flying to arms and victory, in accordance with the best traditions of pseudo-patriotic bunkum. They raised what was in those days the enormous total of 700,000 men, for all naval and military services put together. Yet they never got 10,000 men into any one engagement. Their tiny regular navy won undying fame in several frigate duels out at sea as well as in two annihilating flotilla actions on the Lakes. But this was in spite of governmental incapacity. The American seamen had excellent ships and highly trained crews, and they fought far away from political headquarters. When the *Shannon* fought the *Chesapeake* the tables were turned because Broke was the best gunnery expert in the British Navy, and because he had brought his crew to the utmost perfection of discipline and training after a continuous commission of seven years. The tables were also turned in the final campaign at sea simply because the well co-ordinated operations of the British Navy made it impossible for any vessel, naval or mercantile, to sail the sea under the Stars and Stripes, precisely in the same way as now, a hundred years later, the sea remains open to British—including Canadian—commerce, while it is absolutely closed to every craft that flies the German flag. We might also remember that the more than five hundred American privateers did next to nothing for their own side compared with what was done by the less than fifty vessels of the Navy. But then, as now, a few dramatic

episodes on one side distracted popular attention from the overwhelming advantages on the other. More is talked about the splendidly gallant and enterprising German *Emden* and her brilliant raids in one small corner of the world than about the British universal network of attack and defence through which German seaborne commerce cannot force a single ship.

Now for the Americans ashore. Throughout the campaigns of 1812 and '13 the American militia had scattered like a flock of sheep at every point of contact; so there was no surprise on either side when they broke and fled in the usual way at Chippawa in 1814, as they were still being marched from civil life to glory without the intervening worries of discipline and training. But a real surprise was sprung on the British regulars when they were beaten back by American regulars who only outnumbered them three against two. Nor was the mystery explained until it was discovered that these American regulars were the ones who had been the least subjected to political interference and the most carefully trained by professional leaders. The very next month the same lesson was driven home at Washington itself, though in a converse way. Washington was then the capital of a country with eight million inhabitants—exactly the same as our own population now. The surrounding military districts had 93,527 militiamen on paper. But of these only 15,000 appeared in arms to resist the advance of 4,000 British regulars. Of the 15,000 who did turn out only 5,000 actually came into action; and not one single man stayed there after the first exchange of fire. The British general was in a hurry; so he sent 1,500 men straight at the 5,000. When the small advance guard of only 500 British regulars fired a preliminary volley the 5,000 American militiamen lost 8 killed and 11 wounded, and then ran for dear life in a way which gained this battle an immortality of ridicule under the appropriate name of the Bladensburg Races. Meanwhile, in another part of the field, 800 well trained Americans—half of them soldiers, half of them sailors—were making as gallant a fight against the British odds as any one would like to see. After the battle the 4,000 British burnt the whole of the exclusively governmental part of Washington—in justifiable retaliation for the indiscriminate destruction of the old and new capitals of Upper Canada—and then marched back to the fleet, through a district inhabited by 93,527 militiamen, without having so much as a single musket fired at them. It is only fair to add that the outrageous destruction of Newark, when 400 women and children were turned out into the bitter December cold,

was the work of the American militia, not of their regulars; and that the regular American Commodore on Lake Ontario did all he could to repair the wanton damage done at York. The long and the short of the whole vexed question of militia and regular is this:—that there would never have been any regulars in any army if they hadn't been as much better than militia as any other professionals are better than mere amateurs. We must have amateurs. But the nearer they approximate to regulars the better. Man is so naturally inclined to take the cheap and easy way that he would never have become a professional in anything unless the necessity had been plain.

I am afraid, sir, that I have gone rather fully into corroborative details. But the point is worth some elaboration. (Hear, hear.) So, indeed, are many others. But time fails me; and I shall mention a very few before dealing with the final one of all—the present war. I shall confine myself to points of misconception and take only five of these.

First, there is a widespread misconception about the nature of Canadian and Imperial defence, and even about defence itself. Some people go so far as to think—perhaps honestly—that if Canada looks after herself locally she will have done her duty both to the Empire and herself. Of course I need not explain to this audience that, as all the seas in the world are one so the defence of the Empire in a great world-war is also one, and that Canada is no more separable from the rest than Wales from England or Ontario from Quebec. “Each for all, and all for each” is the motto. (Applause.) “United we stand, divided we fall” is the warning. (Renewed applause.) As for the misconception about defence itself, it is almost too absurd for serious discussion. Who ever heard of any man's defending himself by remaining eternally on guard? The best way to meet attack is to destroy your enemy's means of destroying you. (Hear, hear.) Secondly, it is fondly supposed that the “race of armaments” can be stopped by the slackening off of one competitor. That was tried six years ago; but it only encouraged the Germans to make an extra spurt against the British Navy. Sir Edward Grey's recent explanation is the true one: if the leading horse is held back all the others who are in the running will only strain every nerve to overtake him. Thirdly, it is equally supposed that people who are not “groaning under the burden of armaments” either won't fight at all or won't fight much. But how about filibustering in pacific China? How about the South American republics? And how about the wars of the United States? Immediate readiness to fight is ab-

solutely essential when your prospective enemy is ready. It certainly was so in the present war. If the British Navy had not been completely ready, before the war broke out at all, the British Empire would have been smashed to atoms. (Hear, hear.) Moreover, it is only because the Navy is always ready that new forces like Kitchener's Army can be trained at all. (Hear, hear.) Fourthly, it is often assumed that armies and navies must be dangerous to liberty. What nonsense! as if a man's hands were a danger to his head and heart! Soldiers and sailors refer to, and think of, their calling as "the Service"; and they actually are "the Service" in every country with a free government in which the electors take a real interest. Little politicians may be jealous enough. But war requires the fittest at the top; and winning nations see that the fittest get there. Abraham Lincoln and the elder Pitt, each in his own day, were the personification of free government; and both knew how to make fleets and armies the living instruments of a people's will. (Loud applause.) Fifthly, it is often assumed by those who live outside the area of armed competition that war is about to disappear as a factor in the problems of the world. The F rays, the newest explosive—annihilite is the latest, just at present—and other "horrors of war," on the one hand, and pacifist ideas of "modern progress" on the other, are supposed to be killing out war. Perhaps they will. But, in the meantime, we might as well remember one or two facts to the contrary. The phase of evolution in which war is a determining factor has lasted for many thousands of years; no one can deny that we are passing through it still; and such persistent universal forces do not generally come to a sudden full stop. Again, there is no instance known to history in which a pent-up, growing, and ambitious people have ever lived beside another people which had plenty of expansion room without there being war between them. Lastly, there were expert warnings in plenty. But those who didn't wish to hear them simply stopped their ears.

And now, sir, I come to my last point, to the burning question of the present war; and I propose to speak as plainly about our part in it as I have about our long neglect of preparation. (Hear, hear.)

Let us analyze the First Contingent, regardless of timid warnings about invidious distinctions, odious comparisons, or any unworthy fear of laying ourselves open to the aspersion that it is an ill bird which fouls its own nest. Counting out a million foreign-born, we have seven million people in Canada to-day—one million Mother-Country born, two millions

French-Canadians, and four millions who may be roughly classified as Anglo-Canadians. There were 35,000 in the First Contingent, and in the little Naval Service we managed to get afloat. In proportion to population 5,000 of these should have been Mother-Country born, 10,000 French-Canadian, and 20,000 Anglo-Canadian. The real numbers are very different:—well over 20,000 Mother-Country born, barely 10,000 Anglo-Canadians, and probably some 1,250 French-Canadians. The proportional representation is, therefore, as follows: French-Canadians 1, Anglo-Canadians 4, Mother-Country born 32. Various more or less satisfactory reasons are given for this state of things—a state of things, by the way, that is not being reversed by the Second and Third Contingents. Many of the Mother-Country born have not yet taken root out here. They have the highest percentage of able-bodied males within the age-limits of enlistment. Many of them are out of a job. Most of them naturally feel the call of the Motherland more quickly than we do, etc., etc., etc. But the fact remains that twelve per cent. of our total population have produced more men for the front than the other eighty—eight per cent., and that the proportional representation is this: Mother-Country born 32, Anglo-Canadians 4, French-Canadians 1.

What is the real reason? The real reason is, of course, too vastly complex for explanation at full length here. But, in general, it may be epitomized into the title of the present address—War: The Neglected Factor in Canadian Problems for a Hundred Years. Now, at last, the country is beginning to stir. But the neglect of a century is not to be made good in one campaign. Millions of men are fighting for one of the most vital issues in the whole world's history. They have been fighting incessantly for three seasons—Summer, Fall, and Winter. But no combatant Canadian units reached the firing line in 1914. Why? Because, however good the men are, as men, they are not yet, and can not yet be, parts of one military whole. "A man is not a soldier" is Napoleon's way of putting it. The officers form the most serious problem, not through their own fault, but through the fault of a country that never gave them a chance to learn in peace what they have to practice in war.

"But this is perfectly impossible," objectors will say, "in our young and growing country, with all its natural resources to develop, its enormous transportation problems to solve, etc., etc." The answer, the unanswerable answer, is that we must make our choice between the four alternatives. We must either leave the Empire, to be independent or annexed, and to take all the risks of whichever destiny we choose, or else

we must remain within the Empire and make our choice between its patriots and its parasites. Hitherto we have been busy about every great national concern except defence. On that momentous question we have simply drifted along the line of least resistance, without any consistent national policy, and without the equivalent of a single, half-time, national-defence day the whole year round. We should, of course, be wrong to overstrain our young and growing strength. But who can maintain that patriotism would be either beyond our strength or too dear at the price if we put one man in arms for every ten we kept employed in civil life during this supreme ordeal? We have over two million men in Canada. We ought to have two hundred thousand men in arms. More than this, we ought to have had a naval and military system for mobilizing the first hundred thousand within three months, and the second within six. The British Navy gives us the chance of taking our time, in a way denied to other nations; and, with the British Army, it gives us the chance of not mobilizing at all—a chance, in fact, to play the perfect parasite. Afloat we should have had our own part of the Royal Navy or else a navy of our own, in either case with a trained reserve, trained on a sound “militia” basis, behind that again. Ashore we should have had our own little army of regulars and instructors. We require a thorough cadet system to begin with; then a short instructional course with the regulars for every militiaman before he joins his corps; then five annual trainings of twenty days each, or their equivalent; and then removal to the reserve, with obligation to rejoin up to the age of forty—and a similar, but much more elastic system in the case of officers, many of whom would be required to stay on till they had reached the higher ranks. With any working system of this kind we should be safely off the parasitic and safely on the patriotic side. Ten thousand regulars and a hundred thousand militiamen—afloat and ashore, put together—would do. This, allowing for men undergoing courses of instruction—and reservist courses, too—would be barely equivalent to twenty thousand men in permanence; and this again, in its turn, means that a hundred men would be in civil life for every one in naval and military service, since there are two million men in Canada. A people who cannot train a hundredth of its manhood in peace and put a tenth of its manhood under arms in war had better give up altogether.

But for even a hundred men in civil life to train a single one to arms in time of peace, and for ten men in civil life to keep one man under arms in time of war, an enlightened public opinion is required—an opinion, moreover, that is enlightened

enough to be above the meaner side of party politics and above all sundering appeals to racial and religious prejudices. Here, sir, I am very close to dangerous ground. But I assure you that I have no desire to tread on it. Quite the contrary. I propose to end this already overlong address by taking you safely past the quagmires and straight to the firm foundation of the inner truth. There is nothing to fear from the truth. (Hear, hear.)

The outer truth looks bad as regards the whole Dominion. But the Mother-Country born are responding to the full already; and the Anglo-Canadians are gradually awakening to the four alternatives and deciding for the best. The crux of the question is the French-Canadians. Here the outer truth is at its worst; but the inner, on the contrary, is good. Let us consider both: the blackness of the outer first, the brightness of the inner next. With your kind permission, sir, I should like to say that I speak as one who knows the French-Canadians well, who admires their good points exceedingly, and who would not change a single word out of the many thousand he has written in their praise.

The great outstanding general fact is that—as some of their own best men and papers have plainly pointed out—the French-Canadians are conspicuously last of all in furthering the Allied cause. In proportion to their numbers they have supplied the fewest recruits for the Oversea Contingents, the smallest sum total in subscriptions, and the least practical enthusiasm in every way. The small English-speaking minority in the Province of Quebec has supplied more men, money, and practical enthusiasm than the large French-speaking majority. Nor is there at present any sign that this disproportion is undergoing any change for the better. The other day a leading French-Canadian said most of his compatriots looked on the war as if it was a purely foreign one in which they took a merely sentimental or “moving-picture-sort-of interest.” And the worst of this is that it is one of the chief causes why Canada as a whole is last. Such a dead-weight of indifference on the part of most French-Canadians is a very serious drag on the rest of the Dominion. And what makes matters seem worse still is that Quebec, the French-Canadian city, *par-excellence*, is the very place whose French-Canadian population is getting most by the war. The fortifications, the garrison, the Dominion Arsenal, and the Ross Rifle Factory are great sources of revenue for Quebec and corresponding sources of expenditure for the rest of Canada at all times. Since the war began this revenue and this expenditure have increased by leaps and bounds, and are increasing still. Moreover, the

balance in favor of Quebec has been weighed down much further by the camp at Valcartier, with its 35,000 men, and by the fact that Quebec is losing nothing in the way of minor concentrations, war contracts of various kinds, and sundry unconsidered trifles. No wonder other Canadians, growing impatient and not going down to the root of the trouble, have been saying that Quebec was getting everything and giving nothing.

But, before coming to any conclusion on these lamentably true facts, we must view the French-Canadian question as a whole and with all the sympathetic understanding that we can bring to bear. (Applause.) Viewed in this way the French-Canadians will be seen to consist not of one great reprehensible mass but of three parties, which, in relation to the present war, may be called the patriots, the neutrals, and the parasites. The patriots and parasites form small minorities. The neutrals form the great majority. But the neutrals, if not at present very active practical friends to the cause, are at least potential friends; so that the black, malignant parasites, who are a far greater curse to their own people than to any others, really form only a small, though dangerous, proportion of the whole. The patriots need no explanation; but, other things being equal, they certainly are entitled to far higher praise than their Anglo-Canadian counterparts, for they have to make their way through a double set of difficulties, as we shall presently see.

The neutrals, however, do need explanation, and the most sympathetic understanding, too. (Applause.) How is it that they form the bulk of the French-Canadians in a war like this, where everything French and British is at stake, and into which the British Empire entered to uphold the sanctity of treaties and to defend the Belgians, who are overwhelmingly Roman Catholic in religion and mostly French in speech? How is it that the descendants of the martial French are now so slow in answering the call to arms, so deaf, apparently, to its appeal, even in this great cause, which seems made to be their own? How is it their leaders in Church and State don't sound the trumpet in their ears? The great French-Canadian churchmen did a century ago. When the news arrived of Nelson at the Nile the French-Canadian Roman Catholic Archbishop of Quebec ordained a special thanksgiving for the just laws and protecting arms of the Imperial British Crown. (Applause.) It is not so much a disquisition on the rights of our side and the wrongs committed by the Germans that is wanted now, though even that is needed still, but a direct personal appeal to French-Canadians to enlist. No one can make

such an appeal effectual except their own leaders. Why don't these leaders make it? Are they afraid of getting no response from that race whose well-trained regulars, led by a French-Canadian officer in the Imperial Army, won so gallantly against such odds at Chateauguay? Can they not rise above the petty strife between the Ins and Outs in party politics? Or do they repent—at this most inappropriate time of our supreme ordeal—do they repent of all they have professed in time of peace—that, under the ægis of the Union Jack, they have enjoyed such liberties and advantages as they could not find elsewhere in all the world? No: their true leaders, like all other true Canadian leaders, know perfectly well that the choice for Canada lies between those four alternatives—impossible independence, obliterating annexation, and either the parasitic or the patriotic life within the British Empire. (Applause.) A fifth alternative—dangled by knaves for fools to play with—would be utterly beneath notice if it was not part of the stock-in-trade of the parasites we're coming to. It is that of a separate French-Canadian republic, governed by demagogues and warmed by hot air. (Loud laughter.) We may well laugh at such an absurdity, for how could such a state maintain its real independence when the whole Dominion could not; and would the Dominion itself consent to being cut in two? (Applause.)

But, if all these things are so, what is the real trouble? I venture to think, sir, that it can only be explained, in the very few overtime words now at my disposal, if I may borrow the word *enclave*, dissociate it from its ordinary meaning, and apply it both to our Dominion as a whole and to the French-Canadians in particular. As we all know, an *enclave* properly means an independent state wholly enclosed by the territory of another independent state. Now, suppose we give it, for this once, a purely British meaning, and suppose we use it only with reference to the question of defence. Then I would say that just as Canada has been a sort of *enclave* within the Empire so the French-Canadians have been a sort of inner *enclave* within the Dominion.

The rest of Canada has flowed round and has enisled them on the soil into which they were deeply rooted before there were Canadians of any other kind at all. Thus the average French-Canadian voter has never come into direct personal contact with the really crucial questions of defence—at all events, not for a hundred years. He thinks even less about the needs of the Militia than his Anglo-Canadian fellow-subject does—and that, by the bye, is another reason why it will be so hard to get trained French-Canadian officers to command

large numbers of French-Canadian men. He sees no connection whatever between his own livelihood and the British Command of the Sea; and he would think it an election dodge if you were to point out that his lumbering and dairying compatriots were dependent on the Navy. As for international affairs and the world-wide struggle for existence, well, they may be all right for those who like them, or for those whose special penitence it is to bear them; but, for himself and his own people, that's none of their business, and "on est bi'n icitte," so let well enough alone—just what a good many Anglo-Canadians have long been saying, and with less excuse. It is, by the way, a great mistake to suppose that there is a sort of general Pan-Gallic point of contact with the outside world, and that Frenchmen, Belgians, French-speaking Swiss, and French-Canadians all get on together as if they were one. They don't, as a general rule, except on ceremonial occasions. The French-Canadian has developed into a distinct type; and he is, in certain ways, more British than he knows. This, however, does not imply that, because he is French-with-a-difference, he is not essentially French in race, thought, word, and deed, and that any other conceivable war could make a higher or more intimate appeal to his own better self.

The knotty, the very knotty, problem is this. First, to break down the wholly false frontiers of the general *enclave*, which have so long surrounded the Dominion, and, next, to break down the equally false frontiers of the special inner *enclave*, which surround the mass of French-Canadians. This can be done only by force from without or by persuasion from within. Force from without is not to be thought of, so far as inter-British relations are concerned. But, it certainly would be an effectual means of bursting these bonds if applied by a foreign power, say, in the form of a naval raid on the lower St. Lawrence. Persuasion from within remains. But it bristles with difficulties. Just as no government of any free country in the world can go too far ahead of the mass-sense of its own electorate, so no French-Canadian patriots can lead the mass of French-Canadians out of that inner *enclave* by waving encouragement from beyond the frontiers of the outer one. They must go inside, there defeat the parasites, and then lead their people forth. The line of cleavage in the mass inside will leave very few among the parasites if the work is properly done. But the parasites must be defeated first.

Who are the parasites? They are, ironically enough, the very men who are always using the word themselves about their political opponents. They have, it is true, some right to use it about a good many men of all parties in civic, provin-

cial, and Dominion politics. But, on the question of defence, the beam is in their own eye and the mote in other peoples'. Ah! politics, like murder, will out. (Loud laughter.) But, sir, only in the mere word "political." (Applause.) It is because these parasites are the worst enemies of Canada and of their own great race, it is because I love my native city of Quebec and her proud history, it is because she has borne witness to that "Entente Cordiale d'honneur" which united both races in defence of one country under Carleton and now unites the whole French and British world in defence of general liberty, that I believe our parasites—of whatever race or tongue—should be smashed for ever now. There is nothing to fear from the truth. Therefore let the truth be told. (Hear, hear.) Therefore let the choice be given straightforwardly to the mass of French-Canadians, the choice between the patriot and parasite, and given by their own leaders, just as ours should be to us. (Hear, hear.) Patriotism means a new way of life for the Dominion, full of hardship and self-sacrifice, but also full of promise for the future. I do not for one moment deny that the parasites—and by no means all parasites are French-Canadians (hear, hear)—I do not for one moment deny that the parasites not only promise the pleasures of sin for a season but know they can make the promise good—for a season. But are the wages of sin worth the loss of our national soul! Then let us give our whole-hearted sympathy to those French-Canadian fellow-subjects of our own (applause) who are not only on the patriotic side themselves but ready to fight the parasites for the national soul of the great mass of their compatriots—compatriots in the fullest sense of that glorious word. Nothing more is needed than to get the real truth inside the frontiers of that inner *enclave*. There is nothing to fear from the truth, once it is really understood by an admirably "compatriotic" people whose greater leaders have always shown equal bravery in bearing the Cross and wielding the sword.

But there is a good deal to fear from parasitic falsehood. No one knows better than the parasites how to take every insidious advantage of the ideas that can be most easily perverted inside of that inner *enclave*. The cry of Anglicisation will be raised at once. It might be raised after an address like this, though I would not Anglicize the French-Canadians if I could. Race, religion, politics, education—all will be perverted to ignoble ends for parasitic purposes. But, if the truth is fearlessly told, this perversion will be in vain; for the French-Canadians have their French-Canadian life preserved for them inside the British Empire in a way that would be

utterly impossible outside of it. (Hear, hear.) Let us respect, in the spirit as well as in the letter, this French-Canadian life of theirs. Only, let them do their share, as we, I hope, shall ours (hear, hear) in this great crisis. French-Canadians volunteering for the front, in numbers proportioned to their strength at home, fighting for all things French and British in the world, and against a tyranny that would blot them out in no time (hear, hear), these men, carrying the French-Canadian atmosphere about with them, would be welcome and honored wherever they went. (Loud applause.)

What have the parasites to offer in exchange for this? They have, indeed, one new invention of their own—the parasitic patriot. “The way to be a French-Canadian patriot is to be a British parasite. Get all you can. Give nothing in return.” That, in short, is the practical outcome of all their teaching. It is no exaggeration to say that every teacher graduating from their school for parasites starts out on his tour of perversion with some such confidential stock of precepts as the following:—“Remember that British patriots of all kinds—French-Canadian patriots included—will let us go pretty far, without bringing us openly to book, for the sake of showing a united Canadian front to all their enemies—including ourselves. Explain privately that ultimate British victory is really desirable, because it means safety for parasites, and that the war really does some good by killing off patriots at the front and giving parasites an extra chance of supplanting them in Canada. Confuse all the real issues as much as you can. Mix up educational issues between members of the same communion, though of different tongues, with Dominion, Imperial, and international affairs, and throw so much mud over the whole that some of it is sure to stick. Proclaim aloud that you will die for the faith that is in you. But remember how much pleasanter it is to live for the falsehood instead. Stab Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the back for starting a Canadian Navy, and Sir Robert Borden for trying to add Dreadnoughts to the Navy of the Mother Country. Accuse this most distinguished French-Canadian of selling his compatriots to the British enemy as ‘conscripts’ for a navy to be used in Africa and other bogey places; and forget—as hard as you can—that in the great world-war of to-day there are no ‘conscripts’ whatever, even for garrison service at home. Accuse this most distinguished Anglo-Canadian of trying to sell the whole Dominion for three Dreadnoughts, cash; and forget—as hard as you can—that the German menace you decried one year became the German Fury of the next. Remember that sheep are more easily managed than men, that

the double *enclave* gives you an unusually good chance of proving that fighting men are not required inside of it, and that the guard outside will be provided gratis by others 'whose business it is.' Don't let the people learn the Russian proverb—'Make yourself a sheep, and you'll find no lack of wolves'—because that might be a reflection on the leading parasites, from at least two incriminating points of view. Say your heart can't be in any foreign war unless the French are on the British side; and then find out that, when the French actually are on the same side as the British, you can't fight beside them cause they have been cruel to their priests. Ignore, of course, the fact that twenty thousand priests are themselves fighting for France, that this war promises to see the regeneration of religion in France, and that the British are not really fighting for France but Belgium, where the French language is very strong and the Roman Catholic religion almost universal. Always profess your readiness to fight under 'other conditions'; and take good care that these other conditions change quickly enough to suit the circumstances. Be true to no constitution save that of La Belle Bourassie, a country which cannot conscientiously support 'Great Britain' because Canada is an 'irresponsible dependency'; but which, of course, must never become 'responsible' if responsibility means any kind of risk. Remember that the word Canadian means only French-Canadian, and that all the other present inhabitants of Canada form an army of occupation. (Any allusion to this should always be followed by some reference to the Germans in Belgium.) Forget that the French-Canadians have increased fortyfold while living within the brutal British Empire. Don't go too far in time of danger or your leaders might have to leave you." [This does happen to be true; for it is the way of demagogues when braver followers "go too far." Papineau, for instance, like Lyon Mackenzie, ran away; while the habitants fought to admiration at St. Denis and elsewhere.] "Remember that mountebank heroics are pretty safe beneath the Union Jack, where occasional license is part of the price the stupid British pay for general liberty. Lastly, remember that it is always better to be a snake in the grass behind than a lion in the path in front. Then you will, indeed, be fit to practice the nice black art of Bourassassination." (Loud laughter and long applause.)

Have so many pseudo-patriotic virtues ever been more shamelessly combined with so many genuine parasitic vices? And the worst of it is that this poisoned dish is compounded by men whose betters are being shot every day for far less hateful actions. Every German spy takes his life in his hands,

and often loses it. The Boer rebels broke their oath; but they at least risked their all to do it. Our parasites remain snug and smug inside their own charmed circle of snivelling virtue and snivelling vice.

A sympathetic stranger would certainly think that such a degraded and degrading appeal to all the lower side of human nature would be instantly resented as a deadly insult by people whose blood is French, whose liberty is British, and whose honor is derived from both these noble races. "What," he would say, "how can any man dare to make such an appeal, however artfully disguised, to a people who have produced British leaders as loyal as General Botha is to-day, to a people who have produced the *voyageurs*, the *coureurs de bois*, the defenders of Quebec in 1775, and of the frontier in 1812, who venerate the memory of Montcalm and Frontenac, of la Mère Marie de l'Incarnation and the Jesuit Missionaries, whose devoted clergy have always professed loyalty to the British Crown, and whose statesmen never tire of lauding the glories of the British Constitution?" Yes, this stranger is right, on the whole. But the two *enclaves* must first be reckoned with: the outer *enclave*, comprising the whole Dominion on questions of defence, and the inner *enclave*, comprising the French-Canadians. Each *enclave* is itself surrounded by a frontier of darkness. Perversion is, in the very air of each. And it cannot be till after the outer barrier is down, and the outer air is cleared, that the French-Canadian patriots will be able to fill the inner *enclave* of French-Canadian neutrals with the light of patriotic truth. (Loud applause.)

(January 6, 1915.)

Russia and the War

BY SAMUEL N. HARPER.*

AT a special luncheon of the Club, held on the 6th January, Professor Harper said:

Mr. President and Members of the Canadian Club,—I wish first to thank Mr. Locke for the personal word which he has said in introducing me; and I want also to thank the officers and members of the Canadian Club for the honor of this invitation to speak before you to-day. My justification for presuming to address you is that I have spent the major portion of the last ten years in studying certain aspects of a subject which I wish to present to you and which I hope is of particular interest to you just now: the subject of Russia, of Russia and the War.

We in the United States are asked to observe in this struggle strict neutrality. I interpret this injunction in the sense that it does not impose on the individual not to have sympathies and express them. (Hear, hear.) And in my particular case I believe I am justified, because of peculiar circumstances, when given a chance,—and I always seize every chance given me,—to put before those interested the Russian side of the present controversy. The other sides have been stated by their champions and by their opponents, but the Russian side has been merely hinted at from time to time, and there is very much on the Russian side which should be laid before not only the American public but before you.

There is the excuse for a certain amount of legitimate propaganda. Russia is misunderstood. There is a great amount of prejudice current with regard to Russia; and particularly I would point out the attitude toward Russia which I have found in England. The other day I was very much taken back when at a lecture which I was giving the Chairman introduced me as speaking on that "half-civilized Russia." One has heard a great deal on "Slav barbarism" in these last months. Another expression which is rather current is that

* Professor Samuel N. Harper is a son of former President Harper of Chicago University, and is now Assistant Professor of Russian in that University. He spent several years as a student in Russian Universities.

of the "unnatural alliance," referring to the alliance between Russia, a backward country we must admit, and the democratic countries of England and France. This last point is of particular interest to you, and I wish to go into the setting, if not the history, of the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907, which has contributed in a certain measure to the situation we have to-day.

I would like to give another word of a personal character. For three years I lived in England, where I was associated with the School of Russian Study, started under the energetic management of Professor Bernard Pares, who is now the representative of the British Press Bureau in Russia. Prof. Pares saw this ignorance in England of Russian affairs, and he thought that there was a possibility here for University work in the direction of spreading a more serious knowledge of things Russian in the English public. The work developed, and he invited me to join him in it. For three years I was with this School of Russian Study, and was one of the editors of the "Russian Review," which aimed to spread a more accurate knowledge of Russian politics, history and thought in the English-reading public. My excuse for mentioning this is that in connection with the work in Liverpool I had to study the relationships between Russia and England, in the development of the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907. With these few words of introduction I wish to plunge into my subject. I can state only generalities, and these but briefly; but I take for granted that you have more knowledge than we have in my own country of recent foreign affairs and politics.

One of the most important things in connection with Russian history is the fact of Russian expansion. This has brought Russia into close relationship with England on the one hand and with Germany on the other. Russia has had this greed for land; but I think we can partially accept that interpretation which Peter the Great put upon this land greed, when he said, "It is not land we want, it is water." (Hear, hear.) They wanted markets for development as an industrial country, but what they wanted more was an open sea. Until the 21st of this month the port of Archangel will be open, but then it will be closed by heavy ice floes, and Russia will be cut off, her only line of communication with the western world being by Finland, which is used only by the more venturesome travelers. This line is not open even to magazines, the more serious Russian periodicals, or books. The port of Archangel was used in earliest times, but was abandoned; now they are obliged to come back to it. This indicates that there are insufficient openings for the country.

Russia has looked, now here, now there, for access to the open sea, and always has come back to the natural opening at Constantinople. From the Russian point of view it has always been England that blocked her effort to get to the open sea. In the Crimean War it was England, with others, that blocked her. One of the reasons for the Turkish War of 1877 was to secure to the other Slavic States their independence—for their independence meant keeping that road open; and again England blocked the way.

The economic importance for Russia of Constantinople is very great. I read the other day an article by an Englishman, Lowes Dickinson, in which he intimated that that was not really the reason, that it was not to have the sea open to her commerce, but a route open to her warships, that lay back of Russia's insistence in this matter. In theory the Dardanelles are open to Russian commerce; but take just one instance: in the Turkish-Italian War the Dardanelles were mined for over a month just when Russian exports had to leave, and these could not get out. The industrial activity in the Black Sea basin received a vital blow in the closing of the Dardanelles for six weeks; that was a closing not to Russia's warships but to her commerce.

The attitude of people in England on this question of Russia and Constantinople, I think, can be very well stated in the words I heard used by some one: "In England we have always recognized Russia's need for that opening, but she wanted it so badly that we felt there must be some ulterior motive back of it." (Laughter.)

From talks with men connected with English public circles, and from my reading of English newspapers, I think that the attitude of English public opinion on this question has changed these last two or three years, and that it is not thought now that anything dangerous would result from letting Russia come down through the Dardanelles.

Russian expansion in the Middle East also brought her into touch with England on the question of India. Some saw in any Russian advance in Persia or Central Asia a menace to India. I cannot go into this question. No doubt Russian expansion in this region is very effective. Russia was able to expand, to push in through Turkestan, and out to the east. I think even her severest critics will admit that she had done important work in this district, putting order where there was anarchy.

But on this Middle East question, I believe the most interesting point is that while England was watching Russia very carefully, it was Germany that came in and built that Baghdad-

bahn. Germany's idea was that of an international railway, connecting Constantinople and the Bosphorus with the Persian Gulf, going down through Asia Minor. The English held out against it, because they did not see proper security in the proposals of Germany against the control of this system by the German element in the Company. But the Germans went on with their project; they had secured the concession from Turkey, and through this concession for a commercial enterprise they were gaining considerable political influence in Turkey. In fact, I think it is not too strong to say that German influence was replacing English influence, and that it had become dominant in Constantinople. This was noted. There had been a warning of what this would lead to, but the full force of the Baghdadbahn project was not realized till 1907; and I interpret the coming together of England and Russia as having been an indirect consequence of German development in Asia Minor.

The Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907 was not an alliance; it was not even a general understanding; it was an agreement between the two countries that on the question of Persia they should make mutual concessions; spheres of influence were divided off, and a neutral zone of territory was left as a kind of buffer. This was an opening for further understanding between the two countries on other points, and it undoubtedly meant the avoiding of friction between the two Governments, between the two countries, where friction was bound to develop because they were bound to meet. The attitude of the English public and of the Russian public was very interesting. One met a great deal of criticism from English Radicals, and some English Liberals, who saw in the agreement a sanction for the strangling of Persia. I cannot go into this question. And a great many thought that it was also a kind of English sanction of Russian methods in government. Sir Edward Grey said that the agreement had nothing to do with internal governmental methods of Russia, but somehow many people thought that it implied a sort of approval of the reactionary policies of the Russian Government.

Russia was in a very difficult situation. Russian Reactionaries opposed the Agreement, because they were afraid that it would have a liberalizing effect on Russia! (Laughter.) The Russian Liberals saw the possibility of its lending itself to a movement against Persian nationality, and they regarded it with truly Liberal principles; but they saw in it a leverage which they could use in internal politics, something that would help Russian Liberalism and the cause of reform in Russia.

A very interesting line was the one which divided the Liberals and the Reactionaries. Russian Reactionaries wished the foreign policy to be pro-German; Russian Liberals wished it to be pro-English. It was a perfectly logical and natural alignment.

The Anglo-Russian Agreement was signed in 1907. At the time it seemed to be an attempt to "pen in" Germany; it failed in this respect, however. In 1910 we have the Potsdam Agreement between Russia and Germany. The terms had to do with the Baghdad Railway. We learn the terms from the official authorities, of both Germany and Russia, to the effect that the two countries had found a basis of agreement on several questions of Asiatic issues in the Middle East, in Persia and Asia Minor. This Potsdam agreement was a victory for the pro-Germans in Russia, who had been working for a breach with England. For some months there had been a tension in the relationships between the two countries. The Potsdam agreement was not a formal breach of any previous agreement—Russia did not contravene the Anglo-Russian Agreement by signing the Potsdam agreement; the Anglo-Russian agreement was simply an understanding on certain points and did not preclude the making of other agreements; but it was a victory for the pro-Germans in Russia.

Now, I want to take up the question of German influence in Russia, which meant both economic and political influence. It is in the first place simply the question of the more developed country industrially, Germany getting the market of the less developed industrially, and still predominantly agricultural country, Russia. But the political influence of Germany is said to have been a dominant influence in Russian internal politics. Germany has always taken a great deal of interest in Russian development, following it and studying it with a great deal of care, for commercial relations, to develop her markets; and not until recently, to quote an Oxford professor, has she "discovered Russian barbarism, of which she is talking now so much." (Hear, hear.)

German influences are very strong in Russia, and have showed themselves particularly in the relationships between the heads of the two dynasties. There are naturally close relations between the two Emperors because of their kinship and their neighborliness, and there is no doubt—though this is a thing that cannot be proved, as historians like to prove things—that when the Sovereigns met, as they have done very frequently during these last two or three years, one of the matters discussed would be their internal problems, and that

each would receive advice from the other. The advice given from Berlin was always in the direction of having a less liberal form of government and blocking possible liberal movements.

The Potsdam Agreement was a triumph for the pro-Germans, but friction in connection with Bosnia and Herzegovina qualified this triumph. Then there arose friction over the Balkan War. But more particularly there was the friction that developed this last year over the negotiation for the renewal of a commercial treaty. Russia had had to bear under this treaty for ten years; in 1904 it was renewed for the first time, and to quote the general statement, which I think covers the point, it was the price which Russia had to pay to Germany for her neutrality during the Russo-Japanese War. The proposals from the two sides were to be in by the 31st of last month. There was friction because both the industrial and the agrarian interests in Russia had to get their own Government to support their demands, and to stand out for a proper protection of these interests. It was not a question of one party trying to get special terms of protection at the expense of the other party. Both had to stand out for Russian rights. I think that showed to those of us who were watching the extent of German political influence in Russia.

Another point of controversy between Russia and Germany: General Von Saunders, a German military man, was appointed to train the Turkish army. Russia protested against so prominent a military man being sent; but the Germans said it was not a question of politics but one of expediency. "If the German military reputation is to be at stake," they said, "we must put in a man who is capable." Russia protested, but her protest was set aside; this caused considerable discontent and resentment. In diplomatic affairs Russia suffered defeat after defeat. Russia seemed to count for little in international affairs, and this produced a feeling of resentment and humiliation.

On this same point, I have had several letters from Russia since the outbreak of the war. One struck me as particularly interesting; it spoke of "the sigh of relief in Liberal circles when the bombardment of telegrams from Berlin to the Emperor ceased."

Certain conditions appeared to make it inevitable that Russia would get discouraged in the struggle, and that at an early stage there was a possibility that Russia and Germany would settle their scores. Such a suggestion seemed to me a possibility, perhaps. That, however, was before I became con-

vinced of the new spirit in Russia. (Applause.) Because of that new spirit, I believe, the Russo-English relations are bound to develop, and in a form more acceptable, and in a way that will help this new spirit in Russia. (Hear, hear.)

On this new spirit I can just touch. Conditions prior to the war were very discouraging. I left Russia in April, and there was then talk of revolution. Germany believed this talk, and helped to spread it. Many Liberals believed it. I think we all lost the sense of perspective and looked only at the mass of detail, the evidences of discontent here and there and everywhere. There was one thing that could bring all Russia together. But it is not sentiment only that accounts for this Pan-Slavic idea in Russia. It is, as I have pointed out, a community of interest: for Servia keeps the way open for Russia to the south. Not merely is it fellow interest in the Servians as fellow-Slavs, but it is economic interest as well that operates. The Pan Slavic interest of Russia is spoken of as a thing that one should fear,—the expansion of Russia. Pan-Slavism has been taken in this sense, as developing in the governmental mind, and was a source of anxiety; but this was a policy foreign to the Russian genius and interests. It was unacceptable to Poland, and was unacceptable to Servia. There is another Pan-Slavism, the real Pan-Slavism, becoming more and more articulate. While not yet acceptable to Bulgaria, this new Pan-Slavism is acceptable to Poland, and must be acceptable to the others also. When one hears this talk of Pan-Slav danger, they think of Pan-Slavism as the old conditions made it; they do not realize the new Pan-Slavic idea. And the Liberals and Radicals, who represent this other Pan-Slavism, expected to see a Russian revolution, if there were not this foreign complication. Then they saw in this break with Germany a hopeful sign for the realization of their hopes. The "sigh of relief" mentioned above came when they saw this. One prominent man, a Liberal, said, "The German Government has never had a quarrel with the Russian Government, but always with Russian Liberalism."

Several days ago I was running over a quotation from Maximilian Harden, written in 1911, and in his direct, frank style he said: "We must not wait till the Russian Liberals, who never can be our friends, have regained their strength."

The war brought an outburst of patriotism in Russia; all party differences were dropped, party hatreds vanished,—the session of the Duma showed this beyond all question of doubt. I hear from private letters that the two leaders of Russian nationalism, who were responsible for the anti-Finnish, anti-Polish, anti-Jew policies, are now active in the Red Cross

work at Warsaw, working for the relief of suffering in the Jewish and Polish districts! (Applause.)

This is in harmony with the appeal to the Poles, and the promises to them. This was not purely a war question. The Duma had provided for it, but it was blocked in February by this small nationalist group; but now they have put it through as a war measure, signed by the Grand Duke Nicholas Nicholaivitch. The attitude of the Poles is very significant. There was a bitter hatred of the Russian Governmental policy, but the Poles have long realized that the anti-Polish policy of the Russian Government was not entirely its own, but was impressed upon it by Berlin, ever since the two powers shared in the partitions of Poland, to keep down Polish nationality. That explains how the Poles believe really in the new spirit of the Russian Government and of Russia.

Another indication of this new spirit makes this appeal to the Poles most significant. The Grand Duke, who signed it, has always been a military man, but he here commits himself on a question of politics, and by taking this attitude on the question of giving the Poles their rights, he gives his weight to the Liberal cause.

The vodka monopoly is another indication of this new spirit. It again is not purely a war measure, though it came as a war measure. The Liberals have been urging for years that the Government take effective measures against drink in Russia. In February of last year their efforts came to a point and the Emperor in a ukase deprecated a policy whereby the welfare of the Treasury has been dependent upon the intemperance of the people. The Government received \$350,000,000 in revenue every year from the vodka monopoly. As a temporary war measure the vodka shops were closed. The champions of temperance came out with articles in the Russian newspapers, saying, "We must have this continued; it will cost the Government \$50,000,000 to keep the vodka shops closed. But see what the country is going to get in return for that comparatively small loss of revenue." The decision to keep the vodka shops closed must be interpreted as listening to this public demand, which was again indicative of a new spirit. Some say this is simply a passing mood, but it has lasted five months, and gives no indication of dying out. In any case, it is bound to leave its traces. (Applause.)

There is nothing dangerously Chauvinistic about this new movement. The militant spirit is absolutely foreign to the spirit of Russia. Many of us kept insisting that this anti-Polish and anti-Jew policy was not permanent. We saw indications of its breaking here and there, and we knew it

must be transient. Russia is giving indication of her intention to clean up house. To summarize, let me read from this letter which I have from an Englishman living in Russia, the correspondent for an English newspaper, Harold Williams:

"Of course you must come on. This is just the place where you ought to be now. . . . There are lots of things you won't understand later if you don't come now. You wouldn't know Russia. Everyone is cheerful and full of life. Suicides have stopped, and life has grown worth living now that it is worth dying for." (Applause.) This is very significant coming from an Englishman living there, who is fully imbued with the Russian Liberal spirit. "Parties have got mixed up, Rights and Lefts have been thrown into a kind of cauldron and I haven't the least idea what is to become of it all. At Warsaw I talked several times with Purishkevich." He was a man who did as much as anybody against the Polish and Jewish interests. "He is a ripping Red Cross worker, and has buried the hatchet with all his enemies. He's a flaming patriot."

I have seen an article in a Russian newspaper, written by one of the leaders of the Russian Constitutional-Democratic party, Prince Trubetskoy, which says:

"Without question the most important thing that has happened during these great historic days is the spiritual revolution through which we have passed. For the first time after many years, we have seen a united Russia, a whole Russia.

"In 1877, during the Turkish War, our state of mind was in many respects similar to what we have now. Then also all differences were forgotten: all were united in one thought, in one outburst. When one reflects on our national unity, these great moments are what one always remembers, when the national unity became palpable, visible. And one always wishes to believe that it is precisely in this passing moment that our genuine national force has revealed itself. . . . All these years we have seen parties in hostile conflict one with the other; we have seen classes and racial groups: but *Russia* we have not seen, we did not know where were her will, her thought, her feeling.

"The contrast of what we have now with what we had before has revealed the one great secret of our national life. For the second time in my memory, Russia finds her spiritual unity in a war of Liberation. . . .

"This trait of the Russian character is often explained as our 'groundless idealism,' our 'impractical dreaming,' or even 'cosmopolitanism'—the absence of a 'healthy national feeling,' and the Germans are held up to us as examples.

"Now, that this model, from which our Nationalistic programme slavishly copied, has been so thoroughly discredited, it is not hard to answer these charges. That which seemed to many impractical idealism and fanciful dreaming is in fact the healthy consciousness of the Russian national interest, which is closely bound up with a just and human attitude toward other peoples. Fortunately for Russia the liberation of other peoples, especially Slav peoples, is the condition not only of her spiritual but also of material integrity. The unity and integrity of Russia, and the liberation of fellow Slav peoples, those are the two slogans in the name of which the war is being fought. . . .

"Good neighborly relations between Russia on the one hand, and Austria and Germany on the other, have existed and have been maintained at the expense of Slavdom, especially at the expense of Poland. It was the participation in the partitions of Poland that supported this harmony; a common struggle against a Slav people, kindred of ours, was the source of the close relationship. And this relationship brought advantages to Germany and Austria, but not to Russia. It weakened Russia, because it prevented her from coming forward as the liberator of the Slav world.

"Now, when this role has been assigned to Russia by the force of circumstances, we see new and manifest evidences of the unity of interests which brings together the Slav peoples formerly hostile to each other. On the one hand Russia will not forget that the Poles, who have been considered the enemies of Russia's interests of State, fell at Kalish and Chenstochova, the first sacrifices for these interests. . . .

"The super-national, super-party spirit of the present war, this is what constitutes the strength of Russia, of the Slavs, and of their allies. We shall not weaken ourselves by any narrow party declarations, or race enmities. We shall remember that devotion to this spirit is our principal superiority over our enemies. To triumph we must first of all preserve this spirit, which is uniting peoples under our flag."

One of the leading authorities on Russian history, Professor Vinogradoff, who refused to write on Russia these last years, because he saw what he considered the real Russia unable to press its demands home, is now writing on what Russia really stands for. I urge you to read that little book, "The Psychology of a Nation," which has appeared in the Oxford Pamphlets. Let me read from an article by Professor Vinogradoff in the "Yale Review" for January, 1915:

He explains that the war has forced people in Russia not only to forget strife and differences, but to reconsider their

positions as parties, and reflect on the problem of reconstruction, but in the mood created by the war:

"There are certain peculiar conditions of Russia's coming of age in public life . . . the walls of Jericho will not fall at one blast of the trumpets . . . but apart from details, I firmly believe that the transformation is approaching. . . . I am sure of one thing:—the people of Russia, and more especially the educated classes, the *Intelligentsia*, *will revive* in the atmosphere of the great reform movement, and may yet astonish the world in peace as in war. The educated Russian . . . may be too impulsive, lacking in discipline, inexperienced in politics, but he has one quality which will save him and his country: he is longing to serve a great idea, and to merge his insignificant self in a common cause. He is by nature a crusader. Let us wish success to his crusade." (Long and hearty applause.)

(January 13, 1915.)

German Behavior in Northern France and Belgium

BY DR. L. E. BROWN-LANDONE.*

AT a special luncheon of the Club, on the 13th of January, Dr. Brown-Landone said:

I fear in coming here to-day that I may not be able to do justice to the cordial reception you manifest to the cause for which I wish to speak, nor to this kind welcome you give me. The pleasure I have in coming, I cannot express. During the two months and a half that I have lived on the other side, I have not been able to speak as freely as in Paris or London.

You, perhaps, do not realize the conditions in the United States. I am a citizen of America. We are a composite nation; and although nine people out of ten, and nine editors out of ten are emphatically pro-Ally in sympathy, they cannot express what they feel, because of the idea of our position as a neutral nation. I have seen confidential letters written by men of prominence in the newspaper world to men in England, stating that since in America the press is supported, as in all countries, by advertising and that since the larger portion of the advertising comes from merchants dependent for their credit upon the German-Jewish bankers, freedom of expression is impossible. Moreover, there is in the States a well-organized German-American society organized by Von Bülow when he was Imperial Chancellor. This organization controls the vote of the Germans in America.

Consequently, influenced by the bankers, by the merchants who depend upon the bankers for their credit, and by the politicians whose positions depend upon the vote of the people, freedom of speech on this subject can now be interpreted as a "figure" of speech.

Hence you understand that I am very glad to find myself here, speaking more freely than I have been able to do in America. (Applause.) I do not wish to indicate that we in America are afraid to speak that which we believe in our

* Dr. L. E. Brown-Landone came to this continent as the Special Envoy of an international society known as Les Amities Francaises. He was in France during the first few weeks of the war, and gained some knowledge of the conditions created by the war in that country.

hearts, but we wish to render the greatest service possible to those people who are fighting the battles of the centuries,—the war of democracy against autocracy! (Applause.)

To-day two great issues face each other,—democratic individualism and international fraternity, in opposition to the principle of military autocracy and international competition.

We must view the struggle as the final conflict of two great systems of government. Here in Canada, the war is a struggle between England and Germany; in France it is a war between Germany and France; in Russia, between Russia on the one side and Austria and Germany on the other.

In the States, being a cosmopolitan people and a neutral nation, we are free to obtain a wider view than any partisan engaged in the struggle.

It is necessary that you as vital partisans in this struggle understand that this is a world war and not a war between England and Germany alone, if you would justly interpret the sympathies and activities of neutral nations, especially the smaller ones.

In Norway and Sweden, for instance, the war is recognized as a war between Germany and Russia. For centuries Russia has been the enemy of Sweden. Hence these countries in supplying Germany with fish and cheese and other food products, are as they believe, aiding an ally who is fighting their century-old enemy.

In France some of the people questioned the sincerity of Italy. Some felt that Italy was waiting to discover which side was going to win before throwing her lot with either of them. Italy could not enter the war in August because she was starving. In May and June before the outbreak of the war, bread riots were frequent all over Italy. All outgoing telegrams were censored. Twenty-seven different republics were established in opposition to the government, and during the early days of June visitors in Florence and Venice were compelled to stay indoors, because of the shooting up and down the streets. Italy was impoverished because of her war with Turkey. It was necessary that she first obtain ammunition and coal and food. As soon as provisioned, Italy will enter the war, and she will enter on the side of the right.

I wish to bring you the viewpoint of France. But before doing so, I wish to explain some of the activities of the war—some of those conditions which outsiders have used in attempting to create friction among the Allies. In other words, an understanding of just how the Allies are working, means sympathy and harmonious support, and with it, confidence that

each of the nations fighting the battles of civilization will do her part.

Do not criticize Russia because she did not reach Berlin the first week in September. It is true that Russia has millions upon millions of men that can ultimately be drawn into the army, but there are only four railroads running from central Russia to the German border. These railroads are of wider gauge than the German railroads. If Russia should advance a million men into Germany there would be no means of bringing supplies to them. Even millions of men cannot fight efficiently without ammunition, without food and without water. The great movements of this war depend upon means of transportation more than upon anything else. Consider for a moment the city of Boston or the City of Toronto. How many years of constructive work have been carried on, and how many million dollars have been spent in creating a water system so that water may be supplied to every man, woman and child in the city? Yet the entire population of Boston or the entire population of Toronto is but little more than half a million people. Consider a moment then the work that would be required if to-night every man, woman and child in your city should move ten miles north, how difficult it would be to get water to them. Then think of an army six times as large as the population of either of these cities, and consider a moment what it means, not only to furnish water, but to furnish food, all kinds of other supplies, and tons upon tons, thousands of tons of ammunition for the great guns.

The Russians are doing the only thing that can be done; they are leading the Germans as far into Russia as possible, and keeping them there. Since they cannot carry their trains over German railroad lines, and since they cannot obtain the German rolling stock, the next best thing to do is to keep the Germans as far from their own base of supplies as possible.

Each time the Germans advance thirty or forty kilometres into Russia (and the Russians are drawing them a little farther each time—a little farther from their base)—the Russians gain a victory. This has happened twice and is now happening the third time. With their millions of men the Russians cannot advance without a transportation system. They can only advance through Hungary; and that they will do!

The question has been asked, why did not France support the English army at Mons more promptly? It was again a matter of transportation. The only ports at which the English could land their men were Ostend and Calais. You, per-

haps, do not realize the difficulties of the Channel; the entrances to channel ports are shallow; during all modern transportation only people and trunks have been carried across this neck of water. There are only a few shallow boats that can enter the Channel harbors of France, and there was no time to construct others.

The German army advanced rapidly and there was only a small army of English to oppose the larger army of the Germans. General Joffre was handling a million men. The English army could not move rapidly enough to join the great French army, and the enormous French army could not move up rapidly enough to join the English before the Germans were upon them. General Joffre then, I believe, performed the greatest marvel in retreat the world has ever witnessed. (Applause.)

You remember one of your greatest generals when commended as being one of the world's great warriors, replied, "No, I have never conducted a successful retreat." General Joffre during mobilization had arranged his men in successive lines from the Belgium border to Paris about thirty-two kilometres apart. When the Germans rushed over Belgium and into France they met the first French line. This first French line gradually retreated, drawing the Germans toward the second line. When the second line was reached the first line of French were put on trains and sent back toward Paris to rest and a fresh line of French soldiers met the already fatigued Germans, who were compelled to make their second run of twenty-five or thirty kilometres and fight against the fresh troops that had been placed in the French second line.

At the end of the second day the French soldiers of the second line were put on trains and sent back toward Paris, while the fresh French troops of the third line faced the still more fatigued Germans. This process of retreat was kept up until the Germans rushing at the rate of twenty-five to thirty kilometres a day were within thirty miles of Paris, far from the base of supplies, and almost exhausted by two weeks' hurried march and fighting through Belgium and France. In front of the forts of Paris, the German army found its offensive campaign blocked. From that moment the rapid offensive war that Germany had planned for years was doomed to failure.

With Gallieni northwest of their advancing line, with the French forts in front, with the French aeroplanes overhead, and with every crossroad, every railroad bridge, every hillside under them mined, there was but one thing for the German army to do, if it was to escape annihilation. I firmly believe

that history will justify me in saying that General Joffre's retreat was the defeat of the German offensive campaign.

Of that other little nation forced into the war by violation of its territory and devastation of its fields, one need say nothing. It stands glorified by its own actions! Belgium stands by herself, alone.

A small country, surrounded by three of the greatest powers of Europe, Belgium need not have suffered as she has suffered. She could have diplomatically protested to Germany against the invasion of her territory and the breaking of the treaty which guaranteed her neutrality. She could have diplomatically excused herself to other powers, sincerely declaring that her small army could never hope to successfully withstand the mighty German military machine—that to attempt to do so would be national suicide.

If Belgium had thus diplomatically protested, but not resisted: her crops would have been left intact; her industries would still be busy, busier than ever before; her people could have sold to the Germans all the products of their fields and their factories; there would have been no fighting in Belgium; not one-fourth of her territory would even have been *traversed* by German troops; Belgium would have had no war expense; her people would still be housed in their own homes, working their own fields, running their own factories; there would have been no want, no desolation, no devastation; no Belgian soldier would have been killed; no Belgian child would be crying for father; no Belgian woman would be weeping for husband or lover.

But Belgium would have lost her individual self-respect and her consciousness of international honor. (Applause.)

Belgium had nothing else to gain, she had everything else to lose; yet she preferred the possibility and the probability of material devastation, rather than place herself before the court of the world as unwilling to make material sacrifices to defend her individual honor and the right and inviolability of international treaties.

Here was a little country of eight millions of people; her estimated wealth more than a thousand dollars to each man, woman and child; no one was extremely wealthy, no one was poor.

Of Belgium's seven and a half million acres, five million were actually under cultivation, more than one acre to each individual of the rural population; and this acreage on July 23rd, 1914, had a value of two thousand million dollars.

The educational authorities were eager for every improvement in the educational system; Belgium had given to the

world Flemish art and oil paintings; almost every village was a museum of the arts of the middle ages.

Her government was one of the most representative in the world; her House of Representatives, as we would call it, apportioned its members according to the number of votes actually cast by the members of each party. There was no intermediate machinery nor any other means of mis-apportioning as in the United States, France and Germany. If, in a Belgium election, five hundred thousand men voted for the Liberal party, five hundred thousand for the Conservative party, and two hundred thousand for the Labor party; the representatives of the Belgium Lower House would have been apportioned thus: fifty votes to the Liberal party, fifty votes to the Conservative party, twenty votes to the Labor party. In no other country were the people so directly represented.

This was the Belgium I saw and this was the Belgium that you might have seen had you traversed her fields and visited her cities the last week of July, 1914. Sixteen cities and twenty villages busy with their work, some with factories running night and day; five million acres of edible vegetables and waving grains; schools and universities crowded; eight million people, neither wealthy nor poor, but all with plenty and with no fear of the future; all busy, contented and happy!

And then, War!

First, the request for permission to transport Germany's troops across Belgium soil into France and the promise of a remarkable market for all her produce, the price to be paid in gold; second, the offer of increased colonial possessions at the close of the war.

Next, Belgium's refusal; and after that the invasion and the devastation.

And now her sixteen cities are either partially destroyed or burned; at best they are not fit for habitation. Antwerp though under fire for ten days is the most fortunate of all the cities, except Bruges, Brussels and Ghent. Reliable men writing personally of the terrific strain upon the people in Antwerp during those ten days of incessant rain of shells, bombs and fire, state that the actual condition will never be known. Thousands of people went insane and hundreds perhaps thousands committed suicide! Yet Antwerp was the most fortunate of all the cities stormed.

Bruges, Brussels and Ghent are vacated by the population and occupied by the enemy; Ostend has been shelled; many of the buildings of Malines, Seraing, Tournai, Alost, Mons, Charleroi, Courtrai, Liège and Louvain are in ashes; they

have not homes even for a quarter of their previous population. In Termonde which on July 23rd, 1914, had a population of forty thousand, there are now *only twenty buildings standing*.

And in the country there are no homes. Practically every acre which was under cultivation from the east of Belgium to the west, and from the north to the south, has been devastated; only the tiniest strip near Holland and the tiniest strip near Ostend have escaped destruction. For miles and miles there are no farm houses intact; the fields are black; crops have been consumed or burned to the ground; three million or more people are without homes and the cold rains falling; four million people are without sufficient clothing and the winter setting in; seven million people are hungry, and little or no food to be had. Fields of wheat, barley and rye have been consumed or burned; crops of beet roots, sprouts and other edibles have been eaten or destroyed; no bread, no flour, no meat, no milk; only dried peas and beans and often no means of cooking them.

This is the Belgium I saw the 23rd of August, not the Belgium I had seen on the 23rd of July.

And France!

The area overrun by the present war in France almost equals that devastated in Belgium. Fields in northeastern France have not been completely burned and devastated as have the farms and fields of Belgium; but at least five millions of her people have been driven from their homes; for twelve weeks battles have been fought over her lands; cities have been battered and burnt and rendered uninhabitable. Lille, Amiens, Beauvais, Leon, Rheims, Châlons, Mazières, each centres of industry, have had their factories shelled and their shops destroyed; their buildings have been torn down or burned; their cathedrals stormed, their population forced from their homes, compelled to flee to other departments of France.

Lille, a city of two hundred thousand, one of the great industrial and manufacturing cities of France, has been stormed, and shelled, and burned.

Châlons, the centre of the great champagne industry which has given support to millions of people in northern France, had its buildings burned, its industries stopped, and its people deprived of work and deprived of home.

Rheims, the great centre of the woolen manufacture of France and another great centre of the champagne industry, has been shelled first by one army and then by another for months.

Maubeuge, Mezières, Longwy, Saint Die, Valenciennes, Douai, Arras, Amiens are all in a semi-ruined condition, their industries destroyed and their people homeless.

Five millions of her people must be cared for by the already burdened French nation. Do not imagine that these women and children are properly housed and properly clothed. Often they left their homes with but a moment's notice. I have seen women and children who were forced from their burning homes at all hours of the night and early morning. *Often the houses were fired before they were awakened.* There was no time in which to grab clothing, no time for anything except to save themselves. Thus they often journeyed, hundreds in groups travelling along the country highways without food and without sufficient clothing. I have seen hundreds wandering thus clad only in the clothes in which they had been sleeping. I have seen an entire hospital with its wounded ordered on thirty minutes' notice, to take a train for the south.

Not only is southern and western France trying to house these five million French women and children driven from their homes in the northeast, but she is also finding homes for the million Belgian refugees who fled into France!

There are no vacant homes in which these French and Belgian refugees can be housed. It is not an easy problem to furnish homes on a moment's notice for a population greater than that of the entire city of New York and Toronto and Boston combined. There are no workmen to build new dwellings. The women are occupied. From Brittany to Marseilles they are carrying on the work of a nation of forty millions of people, looking after the affairs of their families, attending to their little ones, and caring for the greatest number of wounded the world had ever known to be congregated on the soil of any one nation.

France is the Hospital of Europe. Public buildings, hotels, private homes, even cottages are converted into hospitals. France has not only her own wounded, she has also the Belgian wounded, the English wounded, and one hundred thousand wounded Germans.

Excepting the preliminary battles at Liège, Namur, Mons and Charleroi, the fighting along the Franco-German battle line has been in France. It has taken place not with the advance of the German army into France, but with the gradual forcing back of the Germans toward the Belgian frontier. As the German army has been forced back trench by trench, the large number of German wounded have been left upon the fields in France within the advancing French line of battle. The Germans in retreating have been compelled to give their

attention to their big guns, to their ammunition, to their supplies and the German wounded have for this reason been left behind on the battlefield,—thousands upon thousands of them.

As the extensive fighting has taken place during the forced retreat of the Germans, the wounded French have been left on their own battlefields and not *behind* the German lines; the Germans thus have few French wounded to care for, while the French have almost all their own wounded, and most of the English and most of the Belgian, as well as thousands of the German wounded.

The most conservative estimate which I am able to obtain to-day is that there are at least five hundred thousand French wounded alone in France, not counting the Belgians, the English and the Germans.

England would willingly take care of her own wounded if she could get them to England, she would willingly take the Belgian wounded there; but they cannot be transferred across the channel. Not only are many too seriously wounded to be transferred, but more important still is the fact that transports cannot be had. They are needed to carry food and ammunition for those in the trenches.

All France south and west of the battle-line is one great hospital. Limoges! It is a city in central France of eighty-six thousand inhabitants. Two months ago I was informed by the French Ambassador that there were then in the hospitals and about the city *twenty-eight thousand* wounded. And Limoges is not so crowded as some other cities and districts to the north.

However, it has been impossible to transport the larger number of French wounded to the south, because of lack of means of transportation. Remember that all the railroad lines of France are made to centre at Paris. They were built to carry the products of industry under normal conditions from all the departments of France to its great capital. Consequently the great amount of food, the great amount of other supplies and the great amount of ammunition which must be sent to three million and a half men in northeastern and eastern France deranges the entire transportation system. Thousands upon thousands of French, Belgian, German and English wounded are left in the northern regions because there are no means of transportation, no possibility of getting them even as far south as Paris.

Do you now understand why there are women and children in France who are still without homes? Five million French women and children from northeastern France to be housed; one million Belgian refugees seeking some place in which to

sleep; and thousands upon thousands of wounded soldiers—perhaps hundreds of thousands who must be given beds and cared for.

And the number of the wounded is infinitely greater than we have been allowed to know; Germany is secretly hiding her losses; so is France. One waits long in France to learn even vaguely of the killed and wounded who have fallen in engagements weeks previously. England is the only country at war that promptly publishes her losses. It was generally understood during the last two weeks in August that one hundred and fifty thousand English were then fighting. In fact, the number was only eighty thousand! *England lost twenty-two thousand out of the eighty thousand, one man out of every four*; and this loss was certainly not greater than the German losses and not twice as great as the average French loss. How great the present losses are, how many thousands upon thousands are killed and wounded we shall never know till long after the war is over.

But at this moment France must bear the burden; France must house the sick and the wounded even though women and children are without bed and without shelter; and these wounded, long before they are able to walk, must be hurried out of their hospital quarters whether in hotel, cottage or out-building, to make room for the newly wounded arriving train load after train load!

Ah! France! do not forget France!

For fourteen weeks she has been the battle ground for the armies of four nations; five millions of her women and children are homeless. She is the haven of a million and a half Belgian refugees; she is *the* great hospital for the wounded of all nations at war save Russia, Servia and Turkey.

And the women of France! Though their husbands and fathers are away to the war, those in charge of the shops have decreed that every merchant of meat shall send to the starving, one cow, one pig, and two muttons; and that every farmer of France, not in the devastated region, shall send one pig or two muttons.

And this is the spirit of France!

Although France is paying a franc a day to every woman dependent upon anyone of her three million soldiers; although she is paying fifty centimes a day to every child so dependent; although she is caring for a million Belgians; although she is attempting to house, clothe and feed her five million women and children driven from their homes; although she is caring for the wounded of four nations; yet she makes no appeal for aid.

Though France makes no appeal, I make an appeal to you for France; I make an appeal for her women and children, I make an appeal for her wounded soldiers.

We need millions of suits of clothes for old men and young boys; we need millions of suits of underwear; we need millions of warm dresses for women and children, we need all types of clothing; and we need shoes, shoes, shoes!

There is not only need now, but there will be need for many months, perhaps for a year or two years to come. I do not say this lightly or without due caution. I have talked with people in authority of three of the different nations at war.

I know that Germany is well supplied with food, that she has so changed her crops during the last thirteen years that women can till her fields, that she can yield practically enough wheat and practically enough meat to supply her people year after year without depending upon imported food products.

Those who know her great coal and iron resources and her wondrous factories realize that she can continue her manufacture of arms and ammunition at her own convenience. There are those who believe that she has not sufficient supplies of cotton, oil and copper. I cannot conceive that a nation that has been so wise in providing all other materials of war and in rotating her crops to provide sustenance for her army and her people, would be so unwise and so negligent as not to provide these necessities also. I am convinced that the present effort to buy increased quantities of cotton, oil and copper is only another evidence of her wisdom in preparing for the future a greater reserve even than she has at the present time.

Hence we must realize that any demand for help now is not a demand for a contribution to be finished with the donation, it is a demand for organized work which must continue week after week, month after month as long as the need exists.

When I make an appeal for France, I make it in the name of humanity!

Do not say that the Governments are meeting their own needs; no Government, no matter how rich, is able at this time to provide the means of relief necessary to meet the exceptional conditions that exist.

The slaughter in this war is so much greater than was expected, that France as well as all other nations, is unprepared to care for the thousands upon thousands of wounded. The number is beyond imagination.

The battle-line at Gravelotte was five miles long; at Austerlitz eight miles long, at Wagram ten miles; the battle-line along the Austrian-Servian-Montenegro border, fifty miles long, along the Franco-German border is more than three hundred and twenty miles long, along the combined German-Austrian-Russian-Turkish borders, five hundred and fifty miles long; these armies united would form a line of men, millions on each side, stretching from New York to Chicago.

The combined armies of the north and south in the battle of Gettysburg did not aggregate two hundred thousand men; the combined armies in the great battle of Waterloo aggregated two hundred and seventeen thousand men; Russia, Austria, Servia, Montenegro, Germany, England and France have now in the field nineteen million seven hundred thousand men; and without doubt more than one-third of these are under the rain of fire and shell and bomb and shrapnel.

And so I plead with you to help France. Especially to help the threescore little hospitals in the north and the west which are shut off from easy communication, from Paris, and other centres where supplies could be obtained if they were plentiful. I know of the hospital bases at Calais, at Boulogne, at Paris, at Havre, at Dinard; these are all well-supplied, very well supplied compared to the condition of the sixty or seventy little villages through northern France to which hundreds and thousands upon thousands of wounded men have been taken, when it was impossible to transport them to Paris or farther south.

Remember that France has three and a half million men in the field, that the entire train service, all the automobiles, all the omnibuses must be employed to furnish them with ammunition and coal and food and water. And remember that England has now a large army in France, and that although England sends the food to France, after it reaches her shores, the French transportation system must handle it. I know of large private homes, and hotels in Paris splendidly fitted up as hospitals but with no wounded soldiers in them. There are nurses and surgeons waiting at hospital bases with no means of getting to the villages where they are most needed.

I have late letters from nurses and physicians describing hospitals that are not provided for by any society or by any Government, where there are only seventy flannel jackets, thirty-six shirts and no socks, for more than seven hundred men.

I know of other hospitals where there are four hundred beds all filled and not a single trained nurse. I know of other hospitals where doctors and workers have so often vainly tried

to get help that they have given up in despair, not knowing what to do or where to appeal for help. I know of thousands of men dying merely because they have not sufficient cotton, sufficient surgical dressings, sufficient bandages, sufficient iodine or chloroform or ether, and none of the antitoxine necessary.

One nurse writes me of washing out cottons that had been used upon infected wounds so that they may be used a second time to cover the wounds of soldiers just brought in; and these cottons were washed only in water, because they had no more spirits with which to sterilize them.

One of the doctors writes, "Never, it seems can there have been in our planet's history a greater human need than now."

When I ask you for aid I do not ask for money. Money is of no value in France. We have used up everything that can be used. One of the last appeals that came was an appeal for women's gingham aprons or old skirts, out of which pieces of cloth a yard square could be torn. These were wanted for slings. I only mention this to show you how great is the need in France.

We in the United States and you here to-day stand in a new position: we must prove ourselves not only willing to give, but we must sacrifice to give. One trouble here in Canada as on the other side is that we are too rich; we are a new people, and have lived in so great abundance that we have always given out of our abundance, never out of what we actually needed for ourselves. We have done wonderfully well I know, but we must do well; we must do better; we must preach the spirit of giving, by additional giving ourselves.

I know that I am keeping you. (Cries of "Go on!" and applause.) I never mind the time when I am speaking myself; but I am always bored when anyone else is talking! Only a few times in my life have I ever sat throughout a long address. A few months ago, after listening to one speaker for an hour and a half (I was forced to do so out of social courtesy), I expressed myself as believing that any speaker who talked more than an hour was a burden to humanity. One week later on finishing an address I discovered that I had spoken for an hour and three quarters! (Laughter.) You realize then that I understand why you are compelled to go. But one more thing I wish to say, then I will finish. (A voice: "Go ahead!")

I want to speak to you of a new France; France to-day is not the France of a century ago. I speak of a France which

has within the last ten or fifteen years become an Anglo-Saxon France. If France had not been renewed, no one can imagine what might have happened in Paris during the strain of the week before that terrible tension was ended. We knew in France that something was going to happen; perhaps you don't know, but our telephonic and telegraph communications were cut off by Germany on the 22nd of July, the day before the note was sent to Servia. Many of us could not get word through to our friends in Germany, and newspapers could not get word to their correspondents.

This new France, within the last thirty years, has in a sense adopted the educational system of England. More than that, the French people, still so far in advance of most other nations in art, literature, and science, have begun during the last fifteen years to emulate the English race in the development of sports and in the physical training of the body. One result has been the development of stability and stick-to-it-iveness.

It has always been considered that the French are an impulsive race easily fired by enthusiasm, but quickly discouraged if victory does not immediately crown their efforts. Yet during that whole month of tension, there was not one single outburst of enthusiastic passion; they were neither lifted to a great height, nor dropped to a great depth; there was manifested the same stability, the same calm determination, as in England itself.

Stability always accompanies physical superiority. The great development of football in France has had much to do with this. I can mention a dozen or two dozen other causes which have increased the stability of the French people, but this one is so notable, and football is so English, that it serves as an ideal illustration. Fifteen years ago there was no football in France, last year there were over ten thousand teams!

Outdoor physical training for both boys and girls has been introduced into many of the public schools of France through the remarkable work of the Marquis de Polignac and Monsieur Hebert. And the result is not merely physical. It is even changing the French language! The *old avocats* are regretting the change. The new French of the law courts is direct as well as beautiful.

I feel convinced that every Englishman can count upon every Frenchman standing to the bitter end, no matter how long it may take to accomplish it. (Applause.)

If you could have witnessed the calmness, the determination, the quiet grim resolution that permeated all classes in France

during that first week of mobilization; if you could have seen the quiet resigned smile that each mother and wife and sweet-heart and daughter gave to the men who were going away; if you had witnessed the crowds gathered in front of the cafés, and had heard the quiet, calm, dispassionate talk replacing the ordinary excited, animated conversation of the Frenchman; if you could have seen the orderly mobilization of 1,400,000 Frenchmen during the first six days of mobilization; if you could have seen them departing from the stations enthused, yet calm, determined, resigned; if you could have seen the kind, gentle treatment of the thousands of Germans and Austrians caught in the City of Paris when war broke out; and if you had witnessed the departure of the German ambassador with thousands of Frenchmen about, but no hissing, no derision, no shouting; you would have realized as I realized that France had given birth to a new race, just as calm, just as stolid, just as persistent, just as determined to fight to the very end as the English race itself. If you had seen these things then you would understand the spirit that thrilled the heart of every peasant, every bourgeois, every aristocrat, every Frenchman; you would understand the phrase that was whispered throughout Paris when the Germans marched into Brussels: "We will never end this struggle until the Czar, King George, King Albert, and Monsieur Poincaré march down Unter den Linden with the Kaiser behind them!" (Long applause.)

(February 1, 1915.)

The United States and the Present War

BY MR. ALEXANDER DANA NOYES.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club, held on the 1st February, Mr. Noyes said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I appreciate the opportunity to speak to those who I believe understand our feelings on the other side of the line, as I hope we understand yours on this side of the line. Your chairman has said that I will speak on the economic aspects of the war, and I expect to do so. I shall not begin, however, by speaking of that aspect of the war, because in any discussion of this war there is something else that must come first. A couple of months ago, at a dinner similar to this held by the large Economic Club in the city of New York, where there were about a thousand guests in their seats, the same topic exactly was assigned for the speakers. The committee at the last moment, moved with doubt as to whether somebody's feelings might not be hurt, laid down the rule that nothing must be said about the merits of the war question in general, or concerning American sympathy as between the belligerents. As a result, one speaker talked of the need of larger American armaments, another of what Germany was trying to do, another of the business outlook. The members felt they had been treated to a sham discussion. I have no intention of making the same mistake here, because there is no danger of treading on anybody's toes. Gentlemen, I have no need to assure you in the first place that the real public sympathy on the other side of the border is with the Allies. (Applause.)

My distinguished host, Dean Massey, this morning on opening his paper and reading of the German submarines' raid on British steamers yesterday remarked to me, "There is bad news to-day." Then at once he apologized for assuming that my point of view was the same as his. I reassured him by telling him that in New York, and in every other city of the United States with which I am acquainted, precisely

* Mr. Noyes has spent all his life in journalism, and has been Financial Editor of the New York "Evening Post," one of the foremost papers in America, for several years. He is generally recognized as the leading authority on public finance in United States.

the same thing would be said by any citizen of American birth and education of the same news, whether he discussed it on the street cars, at his club, or in his business office.

On the other hand, you know, of course, gentlemen, of what has been called the German-American demonstration. It is of a peculiar sort. In many respects, you can hardly quarrel with the fact that German-born citizens retain to a certain extent their sympathy with what they call the Fatherland. But that this is universal, even among German-American citizens, is not true. I know many of the second and of the third generation of German blood who do not maintain that attitude. A very large proportion have no sympathy with the public demonstration of those whom President Wilson described to their faces as "hyphenated Americans." I understand the feeling of German-Americans who thus dissent. It is not proclaimed upon the housetops. They leave that to the hotheads. You have heard intimations, this past week, that the matter will be carried into politics at the next election, and that no candidate will receive the votes of German-Americans unless he makes plain that he abjures good feeling towards Great Britain. That this is nothing that will come to anything, gentlemen, I am convinced. But if it were to amount to anything, there is nothing that would be more sure to bring about the absolute solidifying of the American citizen's vote, and it would mean the overwhelming of any candidate who would dare to take such a stand on such a platform. (Applause.)

This peculiar lack of tact, lack of a sense of proportion—you might almost say lack of the sense of humor—has been visible throughout the whole war episode. How long before the war began, the ambassadors of Germany at foreign courts were busy in putting their country into a state of diplomatic isolation by displaying the same qualities, you know. Mr. Ferrero, brother of the eminent historian and New York correspondent of the *Corriere della Sera*, has lately told an incident of how, when Italian neutrality was hanging in the balance, the correspondent of one of the principal Rome papers approached Count Bethmann-Hollweg, and inquired what his attitude was towards the question of Italian neutrality. The Chancellor replied, with a pleasant expression of good will towards Italy, that he was entirely satisfied; because if Italy had gone to war on the side of Germany and Austria, the Allied fleets would have attacked Italy on both coasts, so that the war might easily have begun with a defeat.

The admirable tact of such a reply may be judged. (Laughter.)

We have seen incidents to the same effect in the remarks made by Count Bernstorff, so much so that Count Bernstorff is considered an asset of the Allies. (Laughter.) You remember how, when it was rumored that the Germans if victorious meant to seize Brazil and defy the Monroe Doctrine, Count Bernstorff calmly answered No; Germany had given assurance that she had no present intentions toward Brazil; adding, however, quite casually, that she might occupy Canada. And this wholly uncalled-for remark I believe has had a great deal to do with the growing feeling at the present time that we had better increase our armament. (Laughter.)

At the outbreak of the war, or shortly after, the Deutsches Theater in New York, where classical German pieces are presented for German-American citizens, was to be opened for the season, and the question was, what play should be chosen fitly to represent the occasion. I think you will appreciate the force of their selection—it was “Wilhelm Tell.” (Laughter.) All of you gentlemen who are familiar with the story will recall who Tell was and what he did, who Gessler was, what happened to Gessler, and why it happened to him. You will appreciate the humor of producing that play at the opening of the war, at the beginning of the invasion of Belgium, in view of the position at the present time of Germany and Austria. Not least interesting of all, the Austrian as well as the German flag was draped on the proscenium at this representation of an Austrian tyrant invading a little neighbor state in defiance of neutrality, and shot by a “sniper” of that country. That the United States people should have formed its opinion on this war in the way in which it has formed it, ought not of itself to be surprising to the intelligent observers. But the immediateness, the promptness, with which the United States made up its mind was the most remarkable spectacle I have ever seen. One instance in connection with this is that notwithstanding the positiveness of our decision we have preserved our equilibrium; we have not lost temper with Germany. We are willing to discuss the question, feeling sure of our own position. On one point only have we tended to lose it—when we are informed that we are not familiar with the facts, but are simply misled by English lies. Now we are pretty well aware in the United States what was the basis of our decision. To sum up the grounds briefly: they were Bethmann-Hollweg’s speech to the Reich-

stag regarding the invasion of Belgium; the undisputed testimony of the contents of the English White Paper; the admissions and suppressions of the German White Paper regarding the relations of Germany and Austria; the published proclamations of the German army authorities in Belgium regarding the imposition of tribute on undefended cities and regarding the burning of towns and holding of citizens to ransom in revenge for attacks by civilians.

Now, to go aside from the conclusions as to the merits of the general question drawn from these matters of information, one may imagine, I think, the hot indignation of our people, whose farmers at Lexington were "snipers," who knew that the exaction of war tribute during war was contrary to the Hague Conventions signed by Germany herself, and who have read in the *Staats-Zeitung*, the chief pro-German newspaper in the United States, at the time of the sacking of Louvain, the editor's signed opinion that all the treasures of art and learning in the invaded district were not worth the life of one German conscript.

We observe, gentlemen, that all this information is based on undoubted authority—in most cases on undoubted German authority. When, therefore, we are suddenly confronted with the angry assertion from German royalty, from the German Chancellor, from Professor Münsterberg, from Dr. Dernburg, from the German newspapers in New York—even in private correspondence from Germany—that we of the United States do not know the facts of the case and are misled by the lies of England, what in the world are we to answer? Well, what we do answer is that we not only have not framed our opinion as a result of falsehoods or misrepresentations by interested parties, but that we have been so sure of our facts as to escape entirely the influence of some most remarkable misrepresentations and falsehoods by interested parties, not on the side of England! (Hear, hear.)

That this is not an expression of prejudice, will be evident from this: We know, and it is hard to see how the German people should not also know, that the Belgian invasion has been officially explained by German authorities in six separate and mutually contradictory ways: Belgium withheld a cargo of wheat from Germany. Germany knowingly violated international law, and would pay later for it, but had to do it for her own advantage. French soldiers had entered Germany, though not Belgium. French soldiers had entered Belgium, though not Germany. (Laughter.) France would have invaded Belgium if Germany had not. England would have

done it if Germany and France had not. (Laughter.) Since every one of these six explanations but the last, after having been officially asserted, and after having come to us from purely German sources, has been abandoned, the inference is that certainly five of them, and probably six, were very impudent efforts made to influence the opinion of the outside world by German misrepresentations. We are all familiar with the German answers about the cathedral of Rheims. In the first place, it was not fired on. Second, it was fired on because there was a gun in the steeple. Third, there was not a gun in the steeple, but it was fired on because there was a man seen in the steeple making observations. The mind of the United States was made up on the evidence, and that is the reason why the mind of the United States will not be changed. It touches us very closely, and moves us to positive and very vigorous resentment, when the accusation is hurled upon us that we are misled by the falsehoods of England.

So much for the question of American sympathy. I am aware, however, that I was asked in the first place, gentlemen, to speak to you on the economic aspects of the war. I should begin by saying that he is a bold prophet who will predict in any detail what are likely to be the economic effects of the war in America. The entire economic history of the war to date has defied precedent and confuted prediction. We are dealing with new precedents, making new history; we have no parallel case to refer to. The nearest approach to the military and political condition of the world now was of course that in the time of the war between Napoleon and the Allies, a hundred years ago. But the machinery of modern finance and commerce had not then begun to grow up; the credit machinery which has been the core of the problem did not then exist.

As to the ideas which were held on this matter before the war, one might say that the banking world thought such a war as the present one was impossible, because the results would be inconceivable; also, that if there were such a war, it would mean nothing short of the entire collapse of the financial system of the world. Though this was not the actual result, yet we can see how near we came to it. We know how in August we were threatened by the greatest financial panic in the history of the world. For three days the world's financial heart ceased to beat, and for three weeks the world's commerce stopped. We did not realize the worst expectations, because the panic was stopped at its source and thus held in

check. How the world at large emerged from that situation we also know. It had seemed that three things would be inevitable on the outbreak of war: first, the general suspension of great financial houses, faced with insolvency because of their intimate relations with the enemy's markets, and therefore unable to call in their credits; second, the outpouring of holdings of securities of neutral States, in such amount as to crush all markets, dislodge all collateral against loans, and break down the credit of the neutral States; third, such prodigious increase in price of capital by new loans (English and German) as to lower by 10, 20 or 50 per cent. the price of existing securities.

Now, at the present time we know, gentlemen, that none of these things has happened. After the worldwide panic, for a few days in August, the authorities of practically every up-to-date financial country in the world, on varying scales and with varying degrees of skill, utilized credit and created facilities so as to restore the financial equilibrium in a way unexampled in the history of the world. The problem of the operations of the international bankers has been surmounted through the advancing of funds by the Bank of England to make good the money owed to those quarters by markets now engaged in war. When England brought out her huge war loan of nearly \$2,000,000,000, the Bank of England, by a very extraordinary provision, engaged to lend to subscribers on the security of those bonds, at a reasonable rate of interest and up to their full issue price, and to leave the loan standing until the end of the war. (Applause.) The motive for realizing on all other securities was removed, and prices on the stock exchanges are generally back where they closed when the Exchanges shut down at the outbreak of the war. There has been no acute embarrassment abroad; no general liquidation of foreign obligations. Trade has gone on in England, and in most other countries—not at the former activity, but in very fair magnitude.

The experience of Canada and the United States has been most extraordinary. I can speak most surely for my own country. You will remember that the foreign exchange rate, whose normal maximum is \$4.89, went to \$7 in August, and stood at \$5 in the pound as late as October. The feeling of the moment was that our reserves of gold would be drained, and our banks left absolutely helpless. Nothing like this happened. Our New York City 6% bonds, issued at par with a view to raising funds to meet foreign obligations, are selling now, instead of on the 6% basis, at something like

4½%. The "gold pool," organized to provide such gold as was necessary up to \$100,000,000, to export to Ottawa to the charge of the Bank of England, has dissolved without calling for the whole of the fund subscribed. By December our export trade had risen by such leaps and bounds, partly caused by the enormous demands of the war, that whereas our October exports were \$76,000,000 less than in the same month of 1913, the exports of December were greater by \$13,000,000 than a year before, and the January results will probably be even larger.

As your chairman very correctly set forth, we occupy a peculiar position. England is not in a condition to continue financing the outside world on the former scale, while the world must be financed, and so that burden must be borne by the United States. Under the circumstances, it is of the highest possible importance that the United States should take this chief position of economic power. How far the taking up of this burden will or will not interfere with the revival of the purely domestic industries for which we as well as you are hoping, but still doubtfully looking for, and what will be the result after the war, is a problem, which is profoundly difficult.

One may sum up this problem of the future in this way: There are three possibilities, which lead to somewhat different consideration of the problems. The first is the possibility of a short war—that seems now removed from the immediate field of practical consideration. The second is, what would be the experience of the United States and neutral countries in case of a long European war? The third, what after the war is over?

Our experience in a long war would probably involve many advantages, but also disadvantages, in relation to the expansion of trade. But trade is not the only question. In 1907 the eminent French economist, Leroy Beaulieu, estimated that the whole world produces every year, in capital available for investment in new securities \$2,400,000,000. But that sum has been already expended in provision for the first six months of the war; \$1,750,000,000 is the amount of the war loan of Great Britain, and \$1,100,000,000 that of Germany; not to speak of the borrowings of other States. The problem is so new in the world's history that one hesitates to draw positive conclusions from it; certainly it is new in degree, and probably in kind also. When all the estimates made before the war as to the cost—the highest being placed at \$50,000,000 per day—have already been exceeded, and bid fair to be

exceeded, still more largely as the war goes on, and when the full strength of the belligerents is put in the field, how far we must recast our original impressions is a question that baffles the financial imagination.

Probably Great Britain must finance France, and to a large degree Russia. Germany's case is most peculiar. She has enjoyed the advantage so far of being a debtor country to the outside world, and the suspension of debts by the war caused an early apparent increase in available resources. This is the main reason, I take it, why the German Government proclaimed no moratorium. But a situation of that kind is only transitory and temporary. The German Government is approaching a situation now that is different. Sir Edward Holden has called attention, in a London speech, to the paper currency of Germany. The German Reichsbank has suspended gold payments on German currency. An enormous issue of purely fiduciary currency followed, which logically involved a premium on gold. But in Germany, there has been enacted a prohibition against dealing in gold. The fact that prohibition under heavy penalties has prevented open dealing in gold at a premium disguises the nature of the situation to a certain extent. It has, however, shown itself in the perfectly abnormal movement of the foreign exchanges against Germany. That is perhaps only one phase of the problem of exhaustion. Other phases were illustrated last week in the German Empire's seizure of the entire stock of foodstuffs in the country, which are now to be distributed and sold by the Government itself. One might say that a State under such conditions, if isolated absolutely—commercially and economically, as well as financially—from the rest of the world, would be living under the domain of pure Socialism. But no State is or could be thus isolated.

I have been reminded that the question has been already tested once by revolutionary France, where not only was dealing in gold at a premium forbidden, but where the penalty was death. Yet the currency went on that occasion to so low a value on the market as to be purely nominal. Whether this will follow in the case of Germany, one should hesitate to say. But if the statesmen conducting the affairs of revolutionary France were not able to prevent it, it is doubtful if the experts conducting those of Germany will be. As to what the foreign exchanges show, one need only say that if sterling were to sell at such a discount in New York as Berlin exchange is selling now, its rate would be \$4.47, I am aware that the Reichsbank reports \$150,000,000 addition to its gold reserve

since the war began. How was this possible? It may have been that in the patriotism of the hour, the German people came to the Government with their gold and got paper currency instead, knowing that they would not get the gold back. (Laughter.) If they did, it was the first time in the history of the world that such a thing has happened. It is conceivable that patriotic holders of \$150,000,000 gold would have brought it to the Reichsbank all at once, when war began. But precisely how do you account for the fact that the bank increased its holdings regularly, \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000 a week, during all the period from August 1st to December 31st? I don't doubt the patriotism of Germany, and I do not say I doubt the figures of the Reichsbank: I simply say, I don't understand them. (Laughter.)

What will be the effect on the European situation of the enormous burdens of capital and credit now being piled up, and which will continue to grow while the war continues, and even when the war is over, is a problem we have hardly more than begun to consider. You are familiar with Lloyd George's prediction—undoubtedly reflecting the judgment of Lombard Street. Money will continue easy while this enormous structure of emergency currency and emergency credit stands. But four or five years from now,—I cite Lloyd George again—there will be one of the most trying and difficult situations in its history for every State among the belligerents. But it will take a long time to dismantle this structure of credit. The Bank of England was unable to resume specie payments for five years after Waterloo.

While looking to the after effects on the belligerent and the neutral powers, however, one fact is borne in upon us by the experience of the last ten or twelve years—that the resources of capital are never exactly measured: there is always something, some very large amount, not allowed for in calculations, and when the need is urgent, capital comes forth. We see these things in every war. In our own Civil War, at a time when the home resources for our war loans seemed to have been exhausted, Jay Cooke & Co. made a contract with the government to sell its bonds on commission, peddling them through an army of salesmen, through the whole of the United States, and sold, if I remember rightly, \$600,000,000 worth. This capital was not supposed to exist. At such times capital comes out, I will not say from its hiding places, but from its resting places, in a degree that astonishes those who insist on rule and precedent. There may be a similar relief to the strain this present time.

And you remember Macaulay's description of how the mounting debt, after each of England's wars, was described as a burden too great for the nation to bear. The debt created by the Seven Years' War would paralyze the country. That of the American Revolution would crush it. That of the Napoleonic Wars settled the question. Yet we have seen the rise of England to the highest pitch of prosperity and wealth, not many years after the last and most crushing of these blows. One should not be too hasty in estimating the effects of such a strain on nations, for the resources of capital are never wholly measured.

Now, as to the neutral States, a word in closing. We have in the United States, gentlemen, as you know, some difficult problems to meet, and not the least difficult is the question of neutral trade. As to our own position, we have endeavored strictly to hold to rule and precedent. But the laws of the sea, as the London "Economist" has said, are in rags; the laws of contraband are obscure, and the legitimate interests of our merchants and those of any power which controls the seas often conflict. It is most fortunate that we have at the White House a cool-headed citizen, who is able to keep his hand firmly on the situation that we have committed ourselves to—a man in whom the people as a whole, and I believe the English-speaking people as a whole, have confidence. (Hear, hear, and applause.) Fortunately also, we approach the problem with that strong good feeling toward the English peoples to which I have referred already. (Hear, hear.) Not the least consideration is the fact that the efforts of the German-American citizens have been of that character which usually defeats the purposes of their authors.

There remains a very grave problem—the problem of future armament and militarism in the world at large. You know the prediction has been made that when the war is over, this will be a new world—it will not be the world we were living in before the war. This statement, as to political conditions, I believe is quite true. As to economic conditions, it will quite possibly be a new world in the rise to power of younger countries such as the United States and Canada, outside of the area of the strife. Whether the result can be, as we believed it might be at the start, the putting an end to the enormous and perpetual increase of armies and navies, I do not know; no problem is more difficult at the present time. Certainly it is possible to arrive at the opposite conclusion—that whichever side comes off victorious in this struggle, the burden of armaments may be fastened on the world as never

before. Personally I shall hope, as many of the best thinkers do, for the opposite result. M. Taine, the eminent French critic, considering as long ago as 1890 the possible results of the universal armament, and universal conscription, then being fastened on the world, ventured the prediction that the outcome of that kind of militarism would be a war in the twentieth century which would far supersede in violence and scope any previous war, and would be marked by barbaric practices and cynical disregard of international law, in such degree as was never known in European history. It would be pregnant with other consequences impossible to foresee. I mention this, not only because it is one of the most remarkable predictions of the condition of the world at the present moment, but because it illustrates the perplexing nature of the problem—the question how such a process of universal competitive armament, once begun, can ever be brought to an end. This is one of the large considerations which the real statesmen of the world have still before them. For myself and those for whom I speak, I feel confident that, if the scourge of the increasing armament expenditure of the last ten years were to be ended by a readjustment not now possible to foresee, it would be worth the price for which the war was fought. (Applause.)

(February 5, 1915.)

The French Revolution and Modern Europe

BY MR. CECIL CHESTERTON.*

AT a special luncheon of the Club, held on the 5th February, Mr. Chesterton said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—The subject which has been chosen—I will not say I have chosen, because in a sense it has been chosen for me—the subject of my address to-day is, The French Revolution and Modern Europe. And I think, on the whole, that this subject is particularly well worth thinking about and discussing at the present time.

We have all seen within the last four or five years, and still more acutely of course within the last four or five months, the great and happy event, in spite of all the tragedy that may accompany it, of the firm union of the peoples of Great Britain and France. (Applause.) Many of the old historic quarrels have of late been buried, and an alliance has been formed, necessary to the security of European peace and European liberties, an alliance which will continue to be necessary after this war is over, an alliance which will provide the basis, I think, for a reconstruction of Europe upon new and juster principles. And for that reason, because it is so vital that that alliance should not be a mere temporary expedient, but that the same friendship between two great nations of Western Europe should endure and grow stronger in the future, it becomes very important that the people of the two countries—and under that term of course I include the peoples of our great colonial Federations—should clearly understand each other and know each other's history, and should be able to comprehend each other's points of view. And for that reason it is at this moment extremely desirable that Englishmen and Canadians and all those who owe allegiance to the English flag and the English Crown should understand that much misunderstood episode in the history of our neighbors

* Mr. Cecil Chesterton is a brother of Mr. Gilbert K. Chesterton, and himself enjoys a wide reputation as an author and lecturer. He has devoted himself to journalism since leaving school, and is now editor of the "New Witness" in London, England.

and allies which is my subject this afternoon. For of that incident of the French Revolution the new France has been built, and on its indirect effects a new Europe is now in the building, and it is essential to us if we are to comprehend at all what the French people stand for in Europe, and if we are to make an enduring sympathy and understanding between us and them, it is essential that we should understand what that episode really meant and for what it stood.

Now, the first thing to remember about the French Revolution is that it was fundamentally doctrinal, and incidentally of course economic and social. There was excessive taxation, but it was a matter of bad distribution, falling too much on the peasantry and too little on the rich. And there were the privileges of the nobility, once having relation to religion, but long since practically divorced from religious affairs. All these economic and social causes contributed to make the Revolution possible, but ultimately the Revolution preached a doctrine and fought for a doctrine. You can define in a few words what was the central principle upon which the Revolution was based. That principle was called by those who preached it the doctrine of the Rights of Man. It affirmed that men as men had equal rights, and that the secular moral authority of the State rested upon the consent of the popular will. That was the doctrine on which the Revolution rested. And that doctrine is true. (Hear, hear.) Whatever confusions and perplexities there were, and whatever fundamentally irrelevant quarrels—and there were many of them in subsequent history—the doctrine on behalf of which the Revolution was conducted is a true doctrine, and is the only possible sound basis for a State. (Applause.)

Now, of late years especially—especially, for reasons which I shall presently suggest, since the year 1870—there has been a strong disposition to ridicule and represent as fantastic the doctrines of the Revolution, especially that important doctrine of the Equal Rights of Man. The attack on it has taken the form of assuming that the French Revolutionists were babyish lunatics, who could not see facts which stared them in the face, and then elaborately disproving a doctrine which no thinking, not to say sane, man ever held; for example, that men develop in all sorts of ways and with all sorts of talents; as if that were not as obvious to Rousseau and Danton as to us; as if Rousseau had the impression that all must be of the same height, or have equally big noses! (Laughter.) Of course the Revolutionists knew that some men have talents which others have not. But what they affirmed, you will see

in a moment, was that all these differences in character and quality did not affect the rights of men. A man who is short has the same rights as a tall man, an apparently stupid man the same rights as one who is apparently clever. There are not two different kinds of men, for whom two different rights are required. And the affirmation of that law proves that the State must be based upon the things common to all men, not upon those in which they differ.

In the same way cheap ridicule is thrown upon that other doctrine of the French Revolution which Rousseau called the Social Contract. Rousseau is represented as saying—of course he didn't—that at a certain period in the history of the world certain men came together to make a contract as the basis of the State. People who talk thus entirely misunderstand what Rousseau said. The Social Contract is not something that happened at a particular period in the world's history, but it is always happening, as the basis of the State. The doctrine of the Social Contract is that the moral authority by which the rulers are entitled to coerce the citizens of a State and make them obey the law is due to the fact that those rulers are not commanding for themselves but for the common good of all the citizens, to which end all the citizens have surrendered some of their personal rights. That is the doctrine of the Social Contract. And, again, it is a sound doctrine. (Hear, hear.)

To take an example of what I mean: suppose I go along the streets of this town, and some man takes me by the shoulder, and violently forces me to walk with him in a certain direction. He has no right to do this, and I have a right to resist him, even if he is a better and wiser man, and even though he be actuated by the purest possible motives for my good (laughter) nevertheless I have the right to resist him, and I shall resist him, because I as a citizen have that right. But if he be a policeman, though he may be much less pure and wise than I (laughter), and though his motives may be much mixed, he has the right to make me walk with him. *Prima facie* he has the right,—I may dispute his right afterwards—the moral right of that policeman lies in the fact that he is acting as an instrument of the general will. That principle, the working out of that principle, and its conflict with the forces that are more or less opposed to it, makes the whole history of every revolution and its fate.

In the course of its development, it came into a quarrel with a good many human institutions, some good, some bad, some partly good and partly bad. But in nearly every case,

until very late cases, which I am going to examine at the end of this discussion, the challenge which it threw out was based upon the broad principles of the Social Contract, not upon the immediate principle upon which it was fought.

The first quarrel of the French Revolution was of course with the French monarchy. It is important to notice that the Revolutionary doctrine did not necessarily imply the abolition of the French monarchy. The States General of France affirmed the doctrine of the Rights of Man, this creed of a positive democracy as conceived by Rousseau, and applied it to a hundred conditions of French life, the ownership of property, the rights of the leaders and the nobility, the claims of the Church, and other things, for at least two or three years while still retaining the monarchy. And the theory upon which it did that was the perfectly logical one that the King was to be regarded, as they called it, as a hereditary representative. They acknowledged that the King's authority could only be derived from the popular will, but they rightly said, as Rousseau said before them, that the popular will was not the same thing as the machinery of government. Every man was chosen not because he was the tallest man in the country, or on any other ground than that he acted as the mouthpiece of the general will, so his position was quite consistent with the doctrine of the French Revolution. The reason why the monarchy was overthrown in France was not at all because the monarchy was essentially incompatible with the doctrine of the French Revolution any more than that in England or other countries; the reason why it was overthrown was because the monarchy became anti-national.

It is an historical fact, that the monarchy was not overthrown, was not even seriously threatened in France, until, somewhat angry at the loss of certain privileges which had been taken from it as a result of the movement, it began to intrigue with foreigners against France. That the Court committed that deplorable error—crime, I would call it—was largely due to the fact that the Queen was an Austrian, and was not in sympathy with France. She regarded the whole question from a personal point of view. The King, if left to himself, would no doubt have acted in a more national fashion. As a matter of fact, the King, at the request of his wife, began to act. At the request of Marie Antoinette was issued the famous manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick. In June the determination was to oppose the popular will. That manifesto was issued at the beginning of August, or the end of July, 1792, reaching Paris in the first days of August,

1792; that brought the insurrection of the 12th of August, and that was the overthrow of the monarchy.

That quarrel was not absolutely essential to the doctrine of the French Revolution, but naturally following on its development in which the French Revolutionists got engaged came the quarrel with the monarchy, in which the Revolutionists were victorious.

Then followed the quarrel with the Christian Church, as organized in France at that time, the Catholic Church. That also was incidental. Mr. Belloc, who is a Catholic and also a Republican, and a sympathizer with the Revolution, said in his little book, which I would advise every one who wants to understand the Revolution to read, that it was impossible for any Catholic to deem any part of the Revolutionary doctrine as heretical, or any part of it, thrown into the republican form of common doctrine, to be contrary to the Catholic Church. The two things do not really conflict in point of fundamentals. Wherever there is a conflict,—as to spiritual quality of men before their Creator, there is identity. From the point of absence of conflict, the matter is entirely indifferent to Christian doctrine as Christian doctrine. It was indifferent to the secular aims of the French Revolutionary movement. Nevertheless the conflict which developed claims to be the whole history of the struggle between the French Revolution and the Church, because it must be found, as in other cases, a historical accident in which the people were involved. First of all you must remember that all the other people were Catholic. And just before the Revolution Christianity was about at the lowest ebb it had ever reached. In Protestant England, for example,—of course it was the age of the Erastian Bishops, and they were not concerned with attending to their duties as Christian pastors, but enjoying themselves and dabbling in politics. (Laughter.) In France, the people avowedly scoffed at the teachers of the Church. The intelligent and well read, both Catholic and Protestant, were almost entirely free-thinkers. Religion was at its lowest ebb, and the consequence was that the men who conducted the Revolution were like their neighbors, like their parents, like the men who opposed the Revolution, for the most part, quite indifferent to religion, and in reconstituting French society, they assumed that the Christian religion was dead or dying. That, of course, was a grave error on their part, and was afterwards proved to be entirely false. But it looked like it for the moment, and they took it for granted, and made arrangements for the future of the Church of France which looked excellent,

quite tolerable and reasonable. If the Christian religion, as they supposed, as the pagan religion of Europe in the third and fourth centuries with its superstition, was dying or in a decadent close, clung to by a few ignorant peasant families, their plan would have worked. But it didn't work. In consequence it had to face the organized antagonism of Christianity in the countries where it took root.

Then, finally, a third thing happened in the Revolution. As soon as it became clear that the new doctrine had triumphed, and that it had determined on the reconstruction of society on a basis of its new doctrine,—as soon as it was apparent to all men, the forces of privilege in Europe began to attack the Revolution in France. They did so because they rightly felt that the fundamental reconstruction of that country from which nearly all the culture of Europe had spread, and which was, as it is to-day, the battle ground of ideas in Europe, was what they found in practice to be incompatible with the reconstruction of the rest of Europe on the basis of that doctrine. As a result France found herself at war, first with one nation, then with another, and ultimately with most of Europe combined. If France had been made up of ordinary people, they would have been snowed under. But the French are a people who have, beyond almost any other people in the world, an extraordinary capacity for reconstruction on a military basis. (Applause.) Not only can they fight bravely under leaders and in discipline, but they have extraordinary capacity for providing new leaders and discipline at a moment's notice. That saved them; they turned themselves into an armed camp, a military State, beat back all Europe, and ultimately conquered all Europe. It is in the light of that great military capacity to organize itself as a military nation, that you must read all the history of the Revolution.

For example, what people call "the Terror" was simply martial law—undoubtedly harsh, as all military law must at times be, but you don't understand it if you interpret it, as most do, as merely hatred against the privileged classes. The effect on France that all the big kings were arrayed against her was that it became necessary to call anybody a suspect. The whole system of the "Terror" was really a system of military discipline and necessity. It came into existence when the military danger was at its worst, and all the principles of the most violent form coincided. When the extreme danger passed away, "the Terror" passed away with it. Of course it left France a military country. Of course always, in a sense, every Frenchman was a soldier. The result, still following

up the principle of the Revolution, the expression of the general popular will, was that the French people found it more convenient to follow the soldier life than take refuge in representative institutions, so you naturally get the Empire and the rule of Napoleon, and the victorious advance of Napoleon, during the period that followed the Revolution, and brought the Revolution into its third great conflict, its conflict with the old traditional nationalities of Europe. In that struggle its great leader was necessarily broken.

Of course we always think especially, and rightly, of the part played by our own country, England, which had the effect we first note in the impulse of the privileged classes and the dislocating of democratic ideas after the battle of advance in national ideas. Spain did the same, and many other nations, which had hardly known themselves as nations before, became nations under the stress of that great advance.

So we come to the close of the Revolution, to its apparent defeat, and the reconstruction in France and the general reaction throughout Europe. But that reaction was apparent, it was not a real thing. The French armies had carried through Europe the democratic ideas upon which the Revolution was originally based. These ideas did not perish. Men then asserted themselves instead of the power of the privileged rulers, and in England, Russia, Austria, Germany, Belgium, Italy, you find continual movement, the original French impulse trying to reconstruct Europe upon the basis of democracy and recognition of the rights of the individual.

I have said the French Revolution got into quarrels. These quarrels remained naturally. The greatest thing we can say of this dark era in which we have met, is that these quarrels are being healed, by reason of events of which we have no control,—but to my mind most significant,—and the accidental enemies of the last generation are coming together, because they have seen something dominant and apparently omnipotent at one moment in Europe, which they hated more than they hated each other. And they were right! (Applause.)

For that thing, which has challenged Europe to-day, and which is now challenging Europe, is what none other of the attacks on the Revolution were; this challenge with its supreme dogma, its denial of the rights of man—I am not merely saying that as a matter of fact or criticism of current events, but it is true. From the days when Berlin set out to make the King of Prussia the ruler of the world, (laughter) from that day came the denial that men have any rights, by

Frederick the Great, who called treaties "pretty filagree work"; by Bismarck, who told Emperor William the First that all his predecessors had taken territory and he ought to too; by the present Chancellor, who called the treaty with Belgium "a mere scrap of paper." The whole tendency of Prussia has been to deny that men have equal rights, and to affirm the rights and prerogatives of the "Super-man"—the Prussians, that is,—(laughter) or some Prussians,—because I am afraid that a great many Prussians, poor devils, have little enough rights (laughter), but that most men are entitled to nothing except to be used for so strong, beautiful, powerful beings, giving obedience, not getting rights. You will find that affirmed by the great men continually, by Treitschke and Nietzsche. Nietzsche, of course, was a Pole, not a Prussian, otherwise he would not have had the brains, (laughter) but he placed those brains at the disposal of Prussia, so he produced a more lucid expression than they would likely have produced for themselves. Still the fact remains that the essential fact behind Prussia's philosophy is the effect, whether you like it or not, the tendency of military victory is to make people imitate the victor. This is seen sometimes to a farcical extent, as when some British regiments began to wear spiked helmets, apparently on the assumption that the Prussians won the battle of Gravelotte by batting with their heads! (Laughter.)

Much more so was this the case ever since 1870, when a cloud was hanging over Europe. For the French Revolutionary doctrine would finally dispose of all war. Even if or whether it be proved that a State organized on the Prussian principle was great and effective for the purpose of warfare.

Now, what I am hoping is going to come out of this war, is the sure conviction on the part of men that that is false! (Hear, hear and applause.) The victory of Prussia in 1870 was an accidental victory, owing to superiority of artillery and other technical things, over a corrupt French Government. But it did not mean that the idea for which France stands and will always stand in Europe had been defeated. They have not been defeated! They are winning to-day, and we are glad! (Long applause.)

(February 8, 1915.)

The Near East as a Factor in the European War

BY PROFESSOR ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH.D.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club, held on the 8th February, Professor Hart said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—The "Near East," should we note the position of Toronto and proceed in a strict geographic manner, would at this moment be the United States. That Near East, however, is no factor in the European War. Still it is impossible for one of the Mid-Americans to come into the land of the North-Americans without remembering two occasions, in 1775 and again in 1812, when we made a proposal of marriage to Canada, but in both cases she replied: "I can be only a sister to you." (Laughter.) As a nephew, then, if you like, of the Dominion, it gives me great pleasure to see so many of my uncles. (Laughter.) The pleasure is greater because the subject upon which I have been asked to speak to-day is one which has made a deep impression upon my own mind, partly through long reflection, but still more because about a year ago I penetrated into the *sanctum sanctorum* of Turkey and was able to visit one after another those tough Balkan principalities, to see the Austrians, the Servians, the Greeks, the Montenegrins, the Bulgarians, the Roumanians, on their own soil; and to bring home certain deep-seated impressions, and beliefs as to the future.

James Russel Lowell once said, "Don't prophesy unless you know!" (Laughter.) I could not set up for a prophet, but I did say a year ago that there was so much dynamite centred about the Balkans that it was certain that an explosion would come within a short time. That explosion came sooner than people expected it; and from a torch lit in a city of Bosnia a flame flashed forth which involved Germany, France, England, Japan, Belgium, and threatens to involve still other

* Professor Hart has been associated with academic life since his school days. He has travelled extensively in the Balkan States, and written books on the conditions in the Balkan countries. He is widely known as an author of important books on certain phases of the history of United States.

nations and to bring on a great international, almost a world-wide war.

Surely no one needs to be reminded that there is a war. I see on the streets of Toronto men who expect soon to experience actual fighting, which if a man escapes never fails to leave its impression upon him for life! (Hear, hear.) But the remarkable fact, gentlemen, is that there is not a war going on, but two great international struggles, either one of which might have arisen by itself, either one of which must be submitted to the arbitrament of the sword, either one of which is of intensest interest to mankind. The first one is that which is nearest to us, the struggle between Germany and Great Britain, the stake in which is pre-eminence or superiority upon the sea, together with the control of colonies throughout the globe. Great Britain, partly by accident, partly by the quality of the nation, partly by its supreme capacity to adhere to that upon which it lays its hand—I am not speaking just now of the Revolutionary War (laughter)—Great Britain has made itself the Rome of our time. It has imposed upon great nations and great areas of the earth the Pax Britannica, a blessing to mankind! (Applause.) Now, that supremacy or superiority is questioned by Germany. It has been questioned in conferences and books and protocols for twenty-five years, and is at last contested in warships and with cannon.

I am not going to touch upon this western war, no matter how near and vital, partly because my own country is more or less involved, where two great military nations seek to carry each its point against the other. I will confine myself to the second, and almost as great war, which at this moment, while we are sitting quietly here, is raging in Poland. There they are hauling great guns, each side determined to press through. What are they fighting for? Is it Warsaw? Not in the least! It is Constantinople. (Hear, hear.) The second of these great wars, parallel to that in the west, is between Germany and Russia. The prize is not superiority this time, but supremacy, in whatever may remain of the Turkish Empire!

The two wars came simultaneously. They might have come at different times. It would have been greatly to the military advantage of Germany if these contests could have been separated. But it did not lie in the nature of things that they could be, because the interest of all the Great Powers in the Near East is almost as great as in the Western question.

I must confine myself to-day to a very brief outline of the reasons why there should be war, and why Germany and Russia should be the contestants. Whatever other results may

come, we may from the outset be sure that when the great peace is made there will no longer be an independent Turkey. (Applause.) The handwriting is on the wall: "The glory of the Turk is departed!" And we are sitting at this moment at the obsequies of one of the proudest, most successful empires of history.

Why should Constantinople be the object for which German soldiers are sent into the trenches to pour out their lives like water? "What's Hecuba to me, or I to Hecuba?" Germany is far from Turkey; they do not touch on the seacoast. A few years ago a line of German ships was started to ply from Naples to Constantinople, but they could not make it pay, there was not enough German trade to support it. Yet at this moment, in the Chancelleries of Germany, alongside the word "London" is written "Constantinople," in letters of fire; and the possession of either of these great cities would fill the German heart with exultation.

When in June, 1913, I made a visit to the Balkans, I went there as a scientific observer. I wanted to see what kind of thing a Balkan was. I arrived there just after the first peace had been signed between the peoples that had been at war. I visited all the Balkan countries except Albania, and particularly Servia, the country now in the furnace heat of affliction. We have been told, or at least the effort has been made to teach us, that the Servians are a kind of barbarians, who kill their own kings if they can not get at any one else's king. It must be confessed that the Servians have gone through an extraordinary amount of unwarlike fighting. The story is told of a teacher who asked a scholar to name the Servian sovereigns who had met with a natural death. The child began naming one and another who had been killed, and when stopped by the teacher replied, "Why, I thought for a sovereign king of Servia it was natural that he should be assassinated." (Laughter.) Nevertheless, the Servians are a good people, though very rude and uncultured; the kind of people we like, farmers, every one living on his own land. There are no great estates. They are a hard-headed, good-natured people, much like the French in character.

The Servians in 1913 had a great army. In 1885 they had been beaten in a campaign of a little more than five days by the Bulgarians, therefore nobody believed they could fight. But I soon came to realize it. I had the privilege of leading a Servian regiment for an entire day. They were noble fellows, and took cheerfully their imperfect accommodations, never faltered or hesitated, never a single man dropped out

of the ranks all day long. Perhaps I ought to explain that they rode on the coal cars which were proceeding south, while I rode in the only coupé in the train, and they didn't know I was there! (Laughter.)

From Macedonia I went to Bulgaria, and was there the second day after war broke out. By the kindly advice of a Bulgarian General whom I knew I managed to escape before the gates were closed, many travelers being obliged to stay. The Bulgarians have had a large part in the Eastern problem, though they have not as yet entered into this struggle. Bulgaria is not in itself an object of desire, for it is a mountainous country, a grain-producing country, and its people are cattle-raising farmers a poor but sagacious and dependable people. The Servians have no seaport, almost no towns, and only one city, Belgrade—alas! no longer a city.

The reason why the Balkans are involved in the struggle is simple: they are "on the road to Mandalay!" If you take a pencil and draw a line from Hamburg on the North Sea to Canton on the coast of China, along the most practicable railway route, that line must pass through Berlin, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Sofia, Constantinople, Baghdad, the cities of the Persian Gulf, northern India, and so to Mandalay. Over this route most of the railway lines will be ultimately built.

For some twenty or twenty-five years, it has rested in the minds of German statesmen that their country had come to a point of world importance; and that to participate in world advantages, they must have a merchant marine. So they built a splendid fleet of merchant ships. Then it must have a navy, and notwithstanding the protests and objections of their near neighbors, that a powerful navy would be incompatible with friendly relationships, they set about building one. They must have colonies, so that the fleet could protect them. But Germany was about a century too late: the English had picked up the most valuable spots. As George Washington said about his Western lands: "It was not to be supposed that those who were first on the ground would fail to secure the most eligible locations." (Laughter.) The Englishman was on the ground first. But the Germans took possession of Kiao Chou—or Tsing Tau, as the town was called, the other name being applied to the district. If you read about the place in German periodicals you would be led to suppose this was the greatest seaport on earth. But if you were to visit it, you would find that as a port it is far inferior to the port of Toronto (laughter)—undoubtedly a great port. Alongside the port is a little town, with not more than ten thou-

sand people, including the garrison. The Germans and the Chinese are on good terms, so much so that the Germans won't allow the Chinese to stay in the town during the night. (Laughter.)

Creating a great port there was like building a great port in Canada at the point of Prince Edward Island. It is not a natural centre for exchange of goods from vessels to rail. The possession of Tsing Tau gave a new point to the Near Eastern question. The Germans argued, "We want to get to the sea. We have a right to such. The English have two routes to the Far East, one by way of the Suez Canal and the other around the Cape of Good Hope; Russia has an overland route to the Pacific by rail. Should not we have one, too?" There is only one land road from Europe to the East, and that leads through the Balkan peninsula and Constantinople.

The difficulties were enormous. First of all, that road must thread the Turkish Empire. Accordingly, about 1890 Germany began to cultivate "the Sick Man of Europe," and the German Embassy at Constantinople became the ganglion of the Turkish Empire. Good advice emanated in copious fountains from that source. Turkey took anything that meant political advantage to her, and rejected anything that meant trouble and annoyance. (Laughter.) Now, came the German Emperor himself to Constantinople, figuratively slapped the Sultan on the back and told him what a good fellow he was, and said, "By the way, some of my people want to build a railway to Baghdad." The Turk asked, "How much is there in it for me?" (Laughter.) Gentlemen, I was not there, and do not claim that this is a verbatim and correct account of what was said, any more than the account of my remarks to-day which the reporters are putting down. (Laughter.) Yet it would seem that something like this was said, judging by the effect, for the railway was built to Kornich, and the concessions were obtained. Next came the question of the Baghdad stretch, which was under construction last year, and eventually will be finished and occupied. Of course that was a commercial, not a political, venture. Politics, however, was at least interwoven. If you are in Constantinople and look up to the hill of Para, you will see one of the most majestic and imposing buildings constructed in Constantinople in a century. That building is the ganglion of the Empire; from that centre emanates the good advice, which the Sultan Follows. When Germany undertook to help in the reorganization of the Turkish army a few years ago she undoubtedly

gave a sort of promise to help the Turks to remain in Turkey.

The German plan of reaching the Farther East seemed to be moving. We must face the fact that it is impossible for any alien country, such as Germany, to acquire the desired influence without taking some of the country. In Asia Minor the ultimate settlement was postponed, because the English and French received concessions for building other railroads in there. At this point Russia comes in. That country lies bottled up, as all the world knows, like a huge retort with four small mouths: one on the White Sea, one on the Baltic, one at Vladivostock on the Pacific, and one on the Black Sea. Three of these mouths are practically sealed up, congealed, in winter, so the natural road for the Russians into the world is over the Black Sea, and through the Bosphorous, the Sea of Marmora, and the Dardanelles. For two centuries, ever since about the time of Peter the Great, the Russians have been pushing first of all to gain the territory on the north of the Black Sea; then gradually to acquire the whole north and east coast; then to push rapidly towards Constantinople. In 1878 Russian banners actually waved in sight of those towers which in 1453 had been broken down when Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks. From that vantage they were pushed back. Bismarck, Disraeli and Salisbury thought they had settled the question at the Congress of London when Disraeli said, "I bring you peace with honor." He brought peace and honor, but not a settlement; it was simply a prolonging of the fitful fever of life for Turkey.

The Russians must get to the open sea. Why, imagine the imperial domain of Canada brought within two hundred miles of the Atlantic, within fifty miles of the Pacific, and within thirty miles of Hudson Bay, without touching either. It is perfectly clear that the young giant would burst the bonds. So these hundred and sixty millions of Russians must have an outlet to the sea, and no force known to mankind, in the long run, will prevent it! (Hear, hear.) There was a force, a combination of France and England, which in 1854 prevented it for a time. But Great Britain no longer resists it. It is useless for such a colonial power, having ports all over the world, to stand in the way of another which is seeking for a single way out to the ocean. I have the idea that neither Great Britain nor France will enter any further objection to Russia obtaining Constantinople and putting her vessels and fleets upon the *Ægean*.

Thus we arrive at the heart of the present trouble. If Germany is going to build a railway through Asia Minor and

eastward through Turkey and Persia, and Russia is going to come down through the Bosphorus to the Dardanelles, just how are these two powers going to live in amity, when their great prize must be Constantinople? Great Britain and France desire it not; Germany and Russia desire it intensely. The Turks are aware of this irrepressible conflict; they know that they must be either hammer or anvil; on the whole they would rather be a part of the hammer of Germany which is striking upon the Russian anvil.

The Balkans—how are they connected with this issue? In a simple manner: the whole attitude of the Germans toward the Turkish Empire involves in the long run the colonization of Asia Minor by the Germans, and also depends upon the possession of a railway line through the Balkans from Belgrade to Constantinople. That is why the war broke out in 1914 instead of in 1915 or 1916. As to the opening action of Servia, the assassination of the heir to the Austrian throne, he was murdered, but not by Servians. His assassins were the subjects of Austria, and residents of Bosnia, an Austrian possession. Now the Austro-Hungarian Empire is made of a great variety of races. So is Canada. So is the United States. I suppose there are as many languages talked in the Balkans as in Toronto. (Laughter.) But Canada and the United States worry little about races. No matter what country or race a man comes from, he comes to this country as a guest. As a guest he must be obedient to the laws and support the government. If he wishes to become a citizen, he must then and there abjure allegiance to any other sovereign, "particularly His Majesty X.Y.," and thereafter he is a Canadian. No foreigner or group of foreigners can claim any special exemption or status or privilege because of belonging to any particular race. How is it in Austro-Hungary? There people speaking fifteen different languages are grouped within one empire. There half a dozen different nationalities harbor. If you are a Magyar you are in a different relation to the Empire from what you would occupy if you were a Bohemian or a Croatian or a Dalmatian or a Galician. All are subjects of the Austrian Empire, and it is held to be right from the point of view of the Austrians, that the minority of the Austro-Hungarian people—the Germans and Hungarians, shall govern the majority, who are mostly Slavs, and shall continue to do so indefinitely.

Much was said to us at the beginning of this war as to the tremendous battle between the Slav and the Teuton. The war has gone on long enough for us to realize that there is no

such struggle. The Germans have lived on amicable terms with the Russians for a hundred and fifty years. Between Austria and Russia there has never been a national war. Those people got on very comfortably together. The real issue and cause of the war was over the question whether the Magyars, in their half of the empire, should subject to their will the Slavs of that half. That is, whether it is a right and proper principle of government to keep great groups of people within a system which they dislike and abominate.

The Servians took advantage of the manifest uneasiness among the Slavs in Hungary and thought it was their chance to win them over. The Hungarians recognized that their rule was in danger. They appealed to the Germans for aid. The Austrian Government sent to Berlin the inquiry what Germany would do, if Austria were in danger, to support it. The information was conveyed back, that the German Government would support Austria.

And one of the main elements of German interest was that Austria's long arm was the one to reach down to the Balkans, and to open up the route through which the missing railway link should be completed. In order to bring that result about, Austria must first possess the Balkans. It is almost five centuries since the Turks came sweeping up, conquering one after another Christian State, and yet the submerged people had preserved their national feeling. I can testify as to the very strong individual and national feeling of the peoples of the Balkans. Montenegro, for example, is one of the tightest little countries in the world, and abounds in large-hearted, good people. Then there are the Bulgarians, with their army; the Servians; the Macedonians; the Greeks. The aim of all was simply to drive the Turks back till they held nothing except Adrianople and Constantinople. That splendid achievement was possible only by hard fighting in 1912. The Balkan army were the first, except the Boers, to find out the military value of deep trenches. The Servians and Bulgarians buried themselves in these trenches and lay there for days.

In order to get to Constantinople via the Balkans, Germany would have to conquer all those people, and there are fifteen millions of them. I asked a Bulgar General how many Bulgarians were in the field in June, 1914. He said six hundred thousand, including transportation service, which would be four hundred thousand soldiers. Yet that country had just passed through a war in which it had lost not less than a hundred thousand men, out of five or six million people. They were again raising 600,000 men, which is not less than ten per cent. of the whole population of Bulgaria.

The only people who have not accepted the Servian control are the Albanians. I shall never forget a mental snapshot I got of the Albanians one day: I asked a man why the Servians did not like them. He replied: "There is an Albanian. He has a gun. You have a button on your coat. He wants the button. He shoots you, and takes that button." (Laughter.)

The Germans, in order to gain their object, must defeat fifteen millions of exceedingly bellicose people, in a highly strategic country, who, you may believe, will perish to a man before they will admit the supremacy of Germany! (Applause.) I think I am equally justified in saying that every one of the Balkan countries would perish before it would admit the supremacy of Russia. They don't want any masters. (Applause.) All they want is individual independence, with the right of cutting the buttons from each other's coats. (Laughter.)

These elements of the present contest in the Near East are combined with the nature of the expiring Turkish Empire. Practically everybody that goes among the Turks comes away with the feeling of admiration and personal attachment to individual Turks. You might ride all over Turkey, and you would find the Turks with their families in their gardens, with their children around them. In fact the Turks themselves think they have the finest social system in the world. There is little talk of the high cost of living when a man never need buy his wife a new dress; she wears the costume of her great-grandmother! (Laughter.) The ladies never go anywhere. They stay at home. Of course they want Papa to stay at home, too, and entertain his family. They are a fine people, and the Turkish soldiers are good fellows. But somehow when you get a hundred, or a thousand, or a million Turks organized into a State, you have one of the worst governments in the world. This is curious, because the greater number of the Turks are really Europeans. The Turkish Empire started with sixty-five men, and combined with other elements of original European stock were a great number of Greeks. Nevertheless the so-called Turks are perfectly infused with the Aisatic system of government, in which the only right is that of brute force.

When the Sandwich Islanders saw people whip horses to make them go faster, they thought if you only whipped them hard enough you could make them fly like the wind. So it has been with the Turkish government of Christians. Talking with a Bulgarian friend, I asked him about a certain good road, bordered with fine trees, crossing Bulgaria. He said Mohar Pasha planted those trees, and a few years after, when

passing, some one told him that they were cutting down those trees for fuel. He called out a body of men, and counted them off,—one, two, three, down to ten, and the tenth man was shot; so on to the twentieth, and he was shot. "Now," he said, "you leave my trees alone!" (Laughter. That is the Turkish theory of government. I would it had not been the theory also adopted by some other nations, who hold that you can do anything by war, if you have force enough. (Applause.) The idea that the way to conquer a people is to put proclamations upon the wall and shoot those who ignore them, is essentially the Asiatic theory of government. (Applause.)

Here then we have the Turks, trained in war since 1912 by German officers, who tried to apply a scientific system. They turned out a great many officers and put in new men; the result was that when they came to the Balkan campaign of 1912 not one of the Turkish armies bore the brunt; they were beaten in every battle in the open field, because the men didn't understand and hadn't confidence in the officers. Every army was broken and never reassembled. Now they are reorganized, but anyone who has been there knows that there is no sufficient concerted action, and no sufficient accumulation of stores and transportation, on land and water. I heard great tales of the retreat after the defeat in Macedonia, unrepeatable tales. Over long stretches you might see little heaps of uniforms, whose soldiers had sunk down and died. That apparently is what is likely to happen to Turkey again. Splendid material, one of the conquering races, and at one time the best artillerists in Europe—their lack is organization, system. The one man who apparently makes the decisions is Enver Pasha, now alive apparently because he shot and killed his superior officer, Nazim Pasha.

Gentlemen, here, in a nutshell, is the question of the Near East: there is a tremendous prize at stake: the forces of Germany and Austria are divided because of the western war, so only half of their armies are available to combat the Russians. Russia may be able to conquer or at least to repel all these armies sent against her. In that event we shall see the extinction of one of the world's great empires. When that empire perishes, what will take its place, and what should a neutral people like the United States prefer? The continuance of the so-called Turkish Empire under the suzerainty of a European Power cannot solve the problem. The absolutely inevitable solution of the Near Eastern question is the possession of Constantinople by the Russians. (Long and hearty applause.)

(February 11, 1915.)

The Monroe Doctrine

BY HON. WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT.*

AT a special luncheon of the Canadian Club, held on the 11th February, Hon. Mr. Taft said:

Mr. President, Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Chief Justice, and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club of Toronto,—"Fools rush in where angels fear to tread," (laughter) but I haven't any responsibility now—I can be a fool if I choose. (Laughter.) Until you have tried it you don't know the pleasure. (Renewed laughter.)

I retain with the liveliest sense of gratitude the cordial reception that I had at the hands of your Club last year, and I could not resist, therefore, the invitation which you sent me to speak again, because it indicated that if I tried your patience you were an enduring people. (Laughter.)

I value the compliment highly of the presence of this distinguished company, of your Lieutenant-Governor, your Chief Justice, and all the gentlemen whose presence here indicates that in this room is the essence of the best of Toronto. I know you won't object to that. (Laughter.) You perhaps will admit it. (Continued laughter.)

Nor am I afraid of the intimation of your Chairman that refers to my love of speech. I agree that Mr. Bryan and I probably have the long distance record in the country. But once I come into the country of your Mr. Justice Riddell and Boanerges Macdonald, I feel that I am in an atmosphere that is entirely homelike. (Roars of laughter.)

I am very grateful to the President of Toronto University for giving me a professional opportunity of coming here, to enjoy again the warm hospitality of this Capital of Ontario, (hear, hear) in the days of the century of peace that divides us and unites us. Certainly it is an occasion for profound gratitude. (Hear, hear.)

It is not that we have not had our differences. If everything had always been smooth, the precedent would not be so

* Hon. Mr. Taft's second visit to Toronto enhanced the reputation he won on his first visit as a speaker and publicist. Certain questions with respect to the Monroe Doctrine, which had arisen just prior to Mr. Taft's visit to Toronto, made his address on this subject particularly timely and interesting.

valuable. Many times there has been a strain. You cannot expect people to live so close without having strains from time to time. But that hundred years of peace has demonstrated that war between us, and that anything that can't be settled by arbitration or judicial settlement, is impossible. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

You didn't like it, England didn't like it, when we had the Geneva arbitration; but you took your medicine, paid your fifteen million dollars like good sports,—and we have had difficulty in distributing it since. (Laughter.)

Then we went into arbitration about the fisheries, and you got five million dollars out of us, and we paid it; we didn't like it, but we paid it. That's what arbitration means; that's what the spirit of arbitration means. You must not go into arbitration with the feeling that you are bound to win and won't abide by it if you don't. In other words, no arbitration is worth anything unless both sides are able to stand defeat. (Hear, hear.)

Now, I am to talk about the Monroe policy. That is ours, not yours; it is nobody's but the United States'. That is the first proposition. When you get that into your heads, you can understand what the doctrine of Monroe was. What followed from that, the corollaries, you understand of course, need elaboration. But that is the first principle with regard to the Monroe Doctrine, and as I trace its history I hope to show you what has followed from that feature of the policy.

First I want to say something with reference to the war. You are strained in your heart strings; you have had awakened a spirit of patriotism in you, a spirit of self-sacrifice, and you are in a tense state of feeling; and therefore it is to be expected that your attitude in looking at many questions is different from the attitude of the United States, which is not involved in this war. The irritations that naturally follow from that difference in situation we understand and bear with. We must look on it as natural, but we must not have anything to break or seriously fracture the bond which that hundred years of peace has made permanent between us. (Applause.)

You knew when you invited me that I was an American, a citizen of the United States, and that we have a President of the United States selected by the people. I am loyal to that President, and get behind him in his foreign policy,—and you would not have any opinion of me if I wouldn't. (Hear, hear.) You see I am just clearing the decks. (Laughter.)

Over ninety years have gone since President Monroe sent his message to the Congress of the United States. The Holy Alliance of Russia, Prussia, France and Austria, with Spain in the outskirts, were looking with very anxious eyes at the spread of republican doctrine, the doctrine of popular government, in South America and Central America by revolutions against Spain. At first, Castlereagh, in England, rather seemed to sympathize with Metternich and the Holy Alliance. Then Canning came in, and he didn't sympathize at all. He urged upon Rush, our Minister to London, that England and America should issue a statement of policy protesting against concerted action by the Holy Alliance to help Spain in her struggle to recover her revolted and revolting colonies. Finally John Quincy Adams, who had had a great deal of experience, and was a very able man,—subsequently one of our one-term Presidents (laughter)—I want to defend that class (renewed laughter)—who was the Secretary of State under President Monroe, and John C. Calhoun, Secretary for War, also a great man, discussed in the Cabinet what should be done. Adams, Monroe, and indeed Calhoun, resolved that there could be no joint action with England on this subject, because the policy they wished to declare was to be the policy of the United States, and ought not to have any contractual character. That I regard as a very important circumstance in the initiation of that policy.

The declaration of the policy in the President's message was of two parts: first, a declaration to the world against any effort on the part of European Governments to force their political system upon any people of this hemisphere, or to oppress it; and that such action would be deemed inimical to the United States; second, that the subjection or colonization by any European Government of any part of the two continents in this hemisphere would also be regarded as inimical to the United States. The first part grew out of the attitude of the Holy Alliance toward the revolt of the colonies of Spain. The second was directed to certain claims which Russia was then making to a right to colonize the northwest Pacific coast of North America claims conflicting with claims of the United States. Our theory was that every part of the two continents had been occupied or taken possession of and belonged to some Government and therefore the colonization of land belonging to some one else was inimical to the United States. Of course the declaration excepted from its application any effort of Spain to recover her lost colonies, or the continued exercise of government by any European countries over colonies they then had.

The language was drafted by Adams, prompted by Canning, and acquiesced in afterwards by him, though he had desired it as a joint declaration. What it means can only be determined by its result in action of the United States, and from the declarations of her statesmen who have interpreted and repeated it.

One of the first instances—I have not time to go over them all—is the rejection by Mr. Webster, under President Tyler, of the proposed joint agreement with England and France as to the disposition of Cuba, should Spain give it up. He said the United States did not object to the retention of Cuba by Spain, but could not consent to the disposal of it to any other power.

Again, Yucatan had revolted from Mexico, and the leaders of the revolt suggested to President Polk their willingness to deliver over Yucatan to the United States for a reasonable pecuniary consideration, (laughter) and then intimated, in order to make the inducement a little greater, that if the United States did not take it, they would go on and offer it to France, Spain or England. To which President Polk answered, that not only would the United States not take it, but the United States could not consent to its transfer to any other country, because she would regard it as “inimical to our peace and safety.”

Again, General Grant formulated the same corollary of the Doctrine in respect to the West Indies.

Finally, when Mexico hadn't paid its debts to France, Louis Napoleon, during our Civil War, sent an army over to that country. Mr. Seward inquired what France intended doing with an army there. The answer was that France was not there for any ulterior purpose, but that Mexico hadn't paid its debts, and this expedition was merely to collect the debts and punish the people for wrongs done to French citizens. France stayed there some time. Then Maximilian and the House of Hapsburg got mixed up in it. The Civil War was over. The President sent Sheridan with a large force to mass along the Mexican border, and then invited France to withdraw, and she did. The course of events was quite significant. I repeat them. When France protested that it was not an effort for colonization or to force her government on Mexico, the United States made no further objection. Then when in spite of this statement an empire was established, the United States objected, and France withdrew.

Then came what some of you recollect who are as old as I am—the Venezuelan business. President Cleveland and Mr. Olney thought they discovered a deep-laid scheme on the part of Great Britain in the guise of a boundary dispute to sequester much territory belonging to Venezuela. It contained, I think, gold mines. England declined for a time to arbitrate. President Cleveland thought that he saw something sinister, and he and Secretary Olney wrote some things that we now regard in the category of things we would rather have left unsaid. In the first place, when you look back at it, it is comforting that we got through as we did! Lord Salisbury had a sense of humor, and dealt with us patiently, and in the end it worked itself out all right. But when you consider that England had her navy and we had just one modern gun on many—I don't know how many—thousand miles of coast,—well, gentlemen, you can see we play poker in our country. (Laughter.)

In the letter of Mr. Olney he said the United States was practically sovereign on this continent, and its fiat was law upon the subjects upon which it exercised its interposition. We don't claim that this is an accurate statement of the Monroe Doctrine.

Other instances, perhaps, have occurred in which the Monroe Doctrine has been asserted. But the student of history and international politics should be careful to look into it and see whether the action of the United States as taken is based on that Monroe Doctrine or on something else, some other circumstances that makes another principle apply.

We have had in the Monroe Doctrine European acquiescence. Canning suggested it and approved of it when announced. Other statesmen of England in office have approved of it. Other countries, perhaps not formally, have acquiesced in it. There has been a great deal of criticism of it in the newspaper press, perhaps officially inspired.—I don't understand official inspiration of the press, but they do have such a thing.—(Laughter.) But on the whole it has been always asserted by the United States and has actually been acquiesced in, whether formally or not. It is not claimed by the United States that it is a principle of international law. It is not claimed that anybody is bound by agreement to observe it. Only the United States has asserted that policy as necessary to its interests.

Now the principle as asserted, is only a corollary of the principle laid down by Washington in his farewell address with regard to entangling alliances with European Govern-

ments. These Washington enjoined upon us to avoid. If European countries were allowed to come here and embroil themselves in controversies on this side of the water, we would be drawn into the maelstrom of European politics. Hence the Monroe Doctrine clearly saves us from entangling connections with European issues.

I have the conviction that the Monroe Doctrine has made for peace in the world. (Hear, hear.) It has enabled the American republics to enjoy independence; it has not enabled them to keep peace with each other, or to keep peace in their midst, but it has kept out of this hemisphere the influence of that land hunger and that growing desire for political colonization of European Governments that would not have made ultimately for the peace and content of this hemisphere. (Applause.)

Now, I quite agree that the revolutions and instabilities of American republics are something one must complain of and should deplore. We have to learn as we go on that people are not all of them fit to enjoy the benefits of popular government. (Hear, hear.) It takes a people that is trained to self-restraint to be able to carry on popular government. Unless a people understands, and the majority respects the rights of the minority, popular government is impossible, because lack of restraint makes a continual succession of revolutions. The party defeated in an election gets rifles and takes to the woods. The proposition always in such a country is that when a man is defeated in an election or in a battle, he loses his head. That view of the game of politics has got to be eliminated from a country before it can really understand and enjoy the benefits from popular government. They are receiving some lessons on this subject down there. It's a long way—(laughter)—to peace!

Now the South American countries, who have struggled through the disease of revolution, and do represent stability of government, the Argentine Republic, Brazil and Chile, are said to object to the Monroe Doctrine. They say it puts them in a state of tutelage, and gives the United States a suzerainty over them; that they are able to take care of themselves. Well, if they had any necessary relation to the Monroe Doctrine if it was a matter of contrast with them, or acquiescence by them, it would perhaps be proper for them to object. I mean if the United States had not exercised the Monroe Doctrine in its own interests, there might be reason for their objection. Moreover, the countries, Brazil, the Argentine and Chile, are not necessarily within its operation at all.

There are two reasons for this. The first is, because they are so remote, that interference with them would but little affect the interests of the United States. The second, because they are able to look after themselves. Daniel Webster, in 1826, when this Monroe Doctrine was new, pointed out, that it affected only the interest of the United States, that if an attack were made on Chile or Buenos Ayres, those countries being so remote, the United States might well conclude that she need only protest; whereas if a hostile force landed on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, then the United States was directly affected and must forcibly interfere. Latin-Americans are a sensitive, high-strung people, and they are prone to undue excitement. The Castilian is a beautiful language, in which one can write accusations and not seem to be impolite. (Laughter.) So they spend their time in their papers in writing attacks on the United States as an ogre, bent on the further acquisition of land, and attribute to her all sorts of motives.

They entertain and express the deepest suspicion of our Cuban policy. Now I think our record in Cuba is one to be proud of. (Hear, hear, and applause.) We went in, but before we went in, passed a self-denying ordinance, that we would not permanently take over the country, and we didn't. We helped them organize a government of their own, left the Island to them, and withdrew. Then after three years they had a revolution. We went in and composed the revolution, brought about order, held an election, installed a new President, and moved out again. I hope we won't have to go in again, but if we do, we will go in and do our best and move out again. (Hear, hear.)

We have a number of our own people, and their voice is entitled to weight, who say that the Monroe Doctrine is an obsolete shibboleth. But let us suppose that we formally abandoned the policy, and announced it to the world. There is a revolution—well, not every minute, south of our boundary, but certainly one every year. Every revolution, every disturbance of the peace, every failure to meet debts, would involve some European country, and if not at present otherwise engaged, they would probably go in there and acquire a foothold. A policy that for ninety years has been acquiesced in without the firing of a shot, is a policy that acquires a weight which is valuable to the peace of the world, and one that we should not give up, although at times we may find ourselves in pursuing it in some embarrassing situations.

There are peace men among us who regret the Monroe Doctrine because in its last analysis it must be asserted and pursued by force. That is true, but in maintaining it for ninety years we have not fired a shot. We should not be peace at any price now. I claim to be a peace man,—but there are degrees of peace men, I find. Some men believe in a perfect supineness, trusting the world to become perfect over night; others believe we should treat human nature internationally as we do human nature in domestic governments. The very essence of the error of Socialism is in the assumption that if you create by law perfect equality, everybody will be perfect and the State will go on perfectly because made up of just men made perfect by the assumption. Well, you can preach that, but you can't practise it. So with respect to peace, I have done my part, as I hope, to help peace along. (Applause.) But that is no reason why we should not face facts, should not know that nations do injustice, should not recognize that there is human nature in Governments; that there is even more human nature in the sense of less moral restraint, in Governments than in the average individual; that masses of men have less conscience than individuals. We must use common sense and a sense of proportion in such matters. That is the difference between the crank and the optimist: the optimist believes in progress, but he knows that the progress of the world comes step by step. He knows you must struggle against the weaknesses of individuals, because society is made up of individuals, and that it is a slow process; therefore while he has ideals, he does not expect to realize them in his lifetime. He almost comes to believe that slow progress is the only real progress. The crank has ideals, not necessarily any higher than those of the optimist, but he must have his ideals realized next morning for breakfast, or he loses all interest in the thing altogether. (Applause.)

Now, there is a second great limitation with reference to the Monroe Doctrine. The first one, as I have said, is that it is the policy of the United States, not contractual with any power, and the sole question in its enforcement is how much it affects the United States' interests. The second great limitation is that it does not contemplate interference with the right of any European Government to carry on war with an American Government under the rules of international law. We have no defensive alliance with any American Government. We do not object to war against a neighbor when it does not mean the forcing of a government on a people or

the acquisition of territory. This appeared in our attitude toward France in regard to Mexico in the sixties. And in the matter of Chile, when Spain was carrying on war, and the question was asked whether the United States would intervene, Mr. Seward answered that our policy did not require us to intervene; that we had not any defensive alliance with Chile. All we insisted on was that they should not force a government on Chile or take any of her territory. Mr. Roosevelt said in some of his messages that the Monroe Doctrine did not involve our objection to armed measures on the part of European Governments to collect their debts. When England, Germany and Italy were assembled to bombard Caracas, he mediated between the parties to that trouble, but not on the ground of the Monroe Doctrine, but on the ground that we were interested in a neighborly way in helping all parties to come to terms.

In the present war, a question has arisen, whether if an expedition were sent against Canada, which is furnishing troops for the war, by Austria, Germany and Turkey, who are belligerents against her, this would be a violation of the Monroe Doctrine, and something against which that Doctrine would require us to protest. It would not be contrary to the Monroe Doctrine as announced. Their carrying on war here would not be a breach of our Monroe Doctrine if we received the assurance that they did not contemplate any permanent occupation or appropriation of territory, or the forcing of their government on Canada. That is all the Monroe Doctrine implies. If it is extended, it must be a new doctrine. I am looking to precedents as Mr. Chief Justice here would. I was once an alleged lawyer, a judge. (Laughter.) Following precedents, I venture this statement with reference to the application of the Monroe Doctrine to Canada in the present war.

Now, I have talked a good deal longer than I ought; there are more things I would like to say. (Cries of "Go on!") Of course we have had a great deal of colonization on this hemisphere by immigrants from European countries. Some have felt danger that these colonies would bring over the Governments from the other side. I don't share that feeling. May I say this? The colonists like and entertain a love for their native country, and indulge that sentiment by fervent expression; but when it comes to inviting its political control, that is another thing. (Hear, hear.) I don't regard such colonies as threatening the Monroe Doctrine at all. The pervading atmosphere of freedom in this hemisphere, even if it encour-

ages revolutions, has the advantage of making people oppose political restraints by governments across the sea.

Now, there is one other subject I want to touch on before I sit down: A misconstruction of the Monroe Doctrine grows out of some action of our Government with reference to Central America and the West Indian countries. We conceived, at least we laid down that principle in the Cuban business, that we were interested in our neighbors, and that these might so act with reference to law and order and the protection of property as to become an international nuisance; if so, it was only a question of time and endurance before we must intervene if the neighborhood was to continue a healthy one to live in, and not to produce a chaos of disorder. That's the case with Cuba, but I hope it will not be so with Mexico. For it is something with Mexico like the case of the man with an invalid wife—it's a rather cruel story—who said to a friend, "I wish my wife would get well, or —— something!" (Laughter.)

Now, with respect to Nicaragua, Santo Domingo, and Honduras, they have gone on through various revolutionary experiences succeeding one another, issuing bonds to European Governments, selling them at large discounts, probably for a number of years. Finally the creditors have come forward to collect the debts. There isn't any money to do this. Now they are attempting to readjust these debts. The European creditors are willing to scale down the debt, but they say, "Suppose we compromise: scale the debt down to fifteen per cent., how do we know that we are going to get the fifteen per cent."

The United States has been anxious to help all these countries. In Santo Domingo we did: we appointed agents who collected the money and deposited part of the money in a New York bank, and the rest was paid to the Santo Domingo Government to meet its regular expenditures. We deposited forty-five per cent. as interest and sinking fund, and turned over fifty-five per cent. to the Government to pay its ordinary expenses. The result was that we accumulated hundreds of thousands of dollars as a sinking fund, and we turned over to Santo Domingo fifty-five per cent. of the money collected, which was largely in excess of any money they had had theretofore for running the government. In these revolutionary Governments, the first thing the head of a new revolt does when he gets a uniform and a sword is to repair to the Custom House and sequester the proceeds of the revenue. If the United States appoints an officer to collect that revenue, and

protects him a revolution is not profitable, and the revolutionists have to go to the agony of spirit of doing a little work. (Laughter.) That was the way we helped Santo Domingo.

We tried to help Nicaragua and Honduras but the Senate objected. Our Executive consented to treaties with those countries, but not under the Monroe Doctrine, but to help them out as distressed neighbors. Our interest was not because of European interference, but mainly in the effort to help to their feet struggling people who were suffering in a land of plenty because of those successive revolutions. (Hear, hear.) There was no honest labor done, because anyone who worked ran the risk of laboring in the fields in order to furnish food for the professional revolutionists.

Many who talk about the Monroe Doctrine do not understand it because they have not gone into the history of that policy. I have endeavored to explain it and have tested your patience in so doing.

I thank you sincerely for the compliment of listening to me, and for the opportunity of giving expression before this great meeting of the Canadian Club to my profound admiration for the Canadian nation. I have lived in Canada in the summer time for thirteen years out of twenty-two. I have an intense interest in your development, profound confidence in the great future of your Dominion, and great admiration for the policy of the Mother Country in lightening the bonds that unite you to the Empire, so far as the control of your destiny and your political government is concerned, with the result that as those reins are lightened, the bond between mother and daughter grows stronger. (Long applause.)

(February 22, 1915.)

Are the Tropics Unhealthy for Germans?

BY DR. J. L. TODD.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club, held on the 22nd February, Dr. Todd said:

Mr. President, and Gentlemen,—I thank you, Mr. President, for the kind way in which you have introduced me, and you gentlemen for having received me so cordially. The President said I was going to give you the scientific names of things, but as we are here for pleasure I will do my very best to avoid technicalities.

Some time ago, your Secretary asked me to address you; the title was to be, "Are the Tropics Unhealthy?" When it was chosen it seemed possible that an address on that subject might supply us with a satisfying half hour; but the war has changed everything.

The last generation, in the United States, was accustomed to fix all points in time according as they occurred before or after their great struggle. Something has happened in our lives which is going to have a similar effect for us and our children, and we are going to think of things as having happened before or after the war. So it was, when the time came to consider precisely what was to be said to you, that there was absolutely no heart in me for the task, and it seemed very plain that the subject chosen could not give pleasure nor could be interesting to you.

So I asked and received permission from your President and Secretary to change the title of the address to "Are the Tropics Unhealthy for Germans?"

I want you to realize, before going farther, that I have written out everything I want to say, for the reason that when a man is speaking off hand there is a tendency for him to say things that may not be perfectly accurate. But what I say is measured, and said in all earnestness; for everything written here, word, chapter and verse can be given; every fact can be substantiated.

*Dr. Todd is Professor of Parasitology at McGill University, and is an authority on diseases peculiar to tropical countries. He recently made known the result of his investigation into the "Sleeping Sickness."

Our question, "Are the Tropics Unhealthy for Germans?" is in reality a double-barreled question: First, are the tropics unhealthy for men; then, are they unhealthy for men actuated by German ideals? Perhaps it will increase your interest if we say at once that the answer is,—the tropics are healthy for men, but not for men who are governed by German ideals.

Let us begin with the first of these questions; it is, after all, by far the most important one, since this war is only a matter of three, four, five or six years, but the tropics will endure while the world lasts. What do we mean when we say, are the tropics unhealthy? Look at your maps: the temperate climates, within which it is commonly agreed that the European races can alone thrive, extend only, shall we say, in Europe from somewhere about Petrograd in the north down to the Mediterranean; and in the western hemisphere from about Edmonton to somewhere about the Gulf of Mexico; in the southern half of the world the most southerly parts of Australia, Africa and South America are included. These are the temperate zones. Many people believe that these are the only parts of the world where white people may settle and live successfully.

In a word, until recently, popular and instructed opinion were practically at one in agreeing that the tropics were uninhabitable for Europeans, and by the tropics were understood the enormous belts of territory on either side of the equator. They included over one-fifth of the total land surface of the globe. That opinion is fast being discredited, and at the present time there are many who know that European peoples can be established and thrive in most places within the tropical zones. When it was said that the tropics were unhealthy, they were said to be unhealthy because of the climate; nowadays we know and realize that it is not because of the climate,—that is because of the purely physical influences of heat, cold, or humidity,—but because of diseases peculiar to the tropics.

Many of these diseases are absolutely preventable, and, with their disappearance, the countries formerly thought deadly for Europeans have come to be almost salubrious. Take the most remarkable instance of this, the Panama Canal. France bankrupted herself and lost twenty thousand lives in failing to build the Canal; the Americans constructed it, and at a cost of less than one cent per man per day for every man working in the Canal Zone the Americans made the death rate there actually less than is the death rate in New York! As a result, to-day it has become quite the thing for a physi-

cian in New York who has a patient who should go away for his health to send him in the winter time on a trip to Panama, once called the deadliest place in the world! (Laughter.)

The history of the study of tropical medicine and of the researches which among many similar results made the Panama Canal healthy, is extremely interesting. As is so often the case with anything that leads to immediate and practical results, we find that the credit for providing the first impetus for the work and for achieving by far the major part of the discoveries which have done so much to make the tropics healthy, belongs entirely to Great Britain. (Applause.)

When Mr. Joseph Chamberlain was Secretary for the Colonies, he perceived what an extraordinary barrier unhealthiness presented to the commercial exploitation and to the settlement of tropical colonies. When Sir Patrick Manson, who was medical advisor to the Colonial Office, urged upon Mr. Chamberlain the advisability of establishing in England schools for the study and teaching of tropical medicine, he found in Mr. Chamberlain a very eager listener. The result was the establishment in 1898 of schools of tropical medicine in London and Liverpool. These were the first to be established, but at the present time there is hardly any University of any importance in any part of the world that has not a chair or a complete school for the purpose of studying tropical medicine. The head of the London School was Sir Patrick Manson; Sir Ronald Ross, who had just discovered that mosquitoes transmit malaria, was the head of the Liverpool School.

To a Toronto audience it is of especial interest to know that a young Canadian physician,—not this Dr. MacCallum, but another,—provided the impetus for most of this work; he made a discovery which was just like the kick-off at a football game. It was the commencement of everything. During the summer holidays he made some investigations near Norval on a malarial parasite of birds, which is found in many Canadian crows. He discovered an interesting stage of its development; it furnished the key to similar occurrences in the parasite of human malaria, which previously were inexplicable.

I heard someone grumbling, to-day, about all the money that is being spent by the Province on Toronto University. The greatest of French kings said that no knowledge was useless. It would be a great thing if everyone could realize that, in dollars and cents, alone, the work which that boy did in his summer holidays by studying crows, has created more values in the world than everything that Toronto has done in the twenty years since he made his discovery. (Applause.)

Since 1898 almost innumerable scientific expeditions have been sent by Governments and by institutions to all the tropical countries; these expeditions have ensured the study of tropical diseases by an increasing number of scientific investigators. Their work has not been without success, and, as a whole, the study of tropical medicine provides one of the most remarkable examples of the way in which success is certain to be achieved, sooner or later, by every wisely regulated scientific investigation.

By ascertaining the cause and the method of transmission of tropical diseases it has become possible to prevent some of them; by the discovery of methods of treatment efficient as remedies, we have been able to cure others.

Let us take malaria. Before 1898 very little was known about it. It annually incapacitated or killed millions of people. It was supposed to be caused by miasma—something like a bad smell. Everybody objected to the suggestion that a microbe, a microscopic creature, could cause it. The idea that it could be due to a protozoan parasite was derided, and there was absolutely no knowledge of the way in which such an infecting agent could get into a man's body. Now, we know that a protozoan parasite does cause malaria, and that it can be acquired by man only through the bite of a mosquito. Its prevention, consequently, becomes simple: kill all mosquitoes, and there can be no malaria; if that is impossible,—for it is difficult sometimes to do so,—prevent mosquitoes from biting men, and men can never have malaria!

In the same way mosquitoes transmit yellow fever, dengue, and elephantiasis, as well as certain other diseases. Therefore, you will realize that the destruction of mosquitoes and protection from mosquito bites are now counted among the most important points to be observed in tropical sanitation. How successful these simple measures can be, has been proved for all time by the record of the Panama Canal zone alone. Malaria, yellow fever, and dengue have been abolished there, just as similar results had been achieved previously in the Suez Canal zone, in Havana, and in the Straits Settlements. Nowadays the destruction of mosquitoes is recognized as of more importance in the work of the sanitary department of a large tropical town than even the disposal of refuse and excreta.

Most of you have heard the doggerel, "The Bight of Benin, and few come out that ever go in." At one time the West Coast of Africa, where Benin is, was called "The white man's grave." It was popularly assumed that every British colony on the coast had three Governors, one on his way out

on a steamer, one carrying on the government of the colony, and the third on his way home in the handsomely appointed coffin which the Government had provided for him! (Laughter.) Even Africa and the tropics were said to be unhealthy because of fevers. The fevers, if one asked what they were, were broadly said to be malarious; and few were bettered by the quinine with which they were all treated. It is now known that there are many fevers other than those caused by malaria, in the tropical world. Like malaria, many of them are transmitted by insects. Sleeping sickness, which is well known largely because novelists and newspaper writers find capital in its unusual name, is one of the best known of these. Sleeping sickness results when a man is infected by a microscopic animal, a protozoan parasite, which is called a trypanosome. The parasite is transmitted by the bites of a fly, the tsetse fly. Sleeping sickness in man is practically identical with the very fatal disease which tsetse flies cause in cattle and other domestic animals. Sleeping sickness, and tsetse fly disease occur throughout tropical and sub-tropical Africa. They still annually kill many men and make it impossible for domestic animals to be introduced. Diseases of a very similar nature exist and are of considerable importance in South America and Asia. Fifteen years ago practically nothing was known of them beyond the bare fact that some of them existed. Now, the nature of the parasites producing them and the method of their transmission has been learned; also, quite an efficient treatment for them has been discovered. Through this knowledge it has been possible to devise methods of prevention and treatment which, not so completely as in the case of malaria, have done much to make it possible for Europeans and for their animals to live in the tropics.

These are extremely important diseases. Had it not been for them, when Saracen power was at its height, Arab civilization would have dominated the whole of the African continent; and the history of the world would have been changed by the existence there of a huge Mohammedan empire. But the domestic animals of the Arabs could not live when tsetse flies were present. The Arabs were unable to exist without their animals, so their spread towards the South was stopped so soon as they came in contact with that fly. So it is interesting to know that the spread of the Saracens to the South was stopped by insects in a rather more precise way than their invasion was checked by insects in the North. Everyone knows that the turning point of the battle, in which Charles Martel broke their European advance, came when the French women threw beehives into the Saracen ranks. The fact that

insects played such an important part in defeating the Arabs will give you some idea of the great economic importance of insects. (Laughter.)

Among the most interesting of tropical diseases are those which are caused by spirochaetes, also protozoan parasites, and also transmitted by the bites of insects. Some of these are acute fevers, such as famine fever or relapsing fever; they still occasionally occur in Europe. Others are characterized by their long duration and by horrible ulcerations. Some of these diseases are transmitted by contact between infected and healthy individuals; in others the little spiral, thread-like microbe, the spirochaete, is transmitted by ticks or by lice. You all know how difficult it is for soldiers to keep themselves free from vermin; just because of that fact, relapsing fever or famine fever, is one of the most feared of the diseases of armies. The past fifteen years has created a precise knowledge of the nature of many diseases caused by spirochaetes, of the means by which they are transmitted, and of a very effectual means of treating them. A successful remedy for dysentery, another important disease of armies, has also been discovered. Five years ago doctors were almost powerless before these diseases; now they can be cured in a week or two.

Just one other example. All of the diseases which I have described so far are caused by microscopic animal parasites, each of which consists of a single cell. Larger animal parasites, consisting of many cells, are also the cause of important diseases, which contribute considerably to the unhealthiness of the tropics. Elephantiasis is a disease in which legs, arms and other parts of the body become so huge that the name is an apt one. Elephantiasis is one of the most picturesque of the diseases caused by worms. One of the most important of them is the hookworm disease. Everybody has heard of the "poor whites," or "crackers," of the Southern States. Nothing is more certain than that the shiftlessness and physical inertia, which made them a derision to their neighbors, is in great part really a symptom of chronic, almost universal, infection by hookworms. The work of the Rockefeller Commission in investigating and treating this disease is beyond praise. Through its work the eradication of the hookworm from the Southern States is quite possible, and that at no distant date. The economic revolution which will follow its disappearance will be, near home, an example of the revolution which is everywhere changing the tropics.

Time does not permit a detailed mention of the many other instances in which increased knowledge has made it possible to prevent or to cure tropical diseases. What has been said,

however, will be enough to prove to you that much has already been done to make the tropics healthy, and to convince you that the studies which have already done so much will not be unproductive in the future.

And what, in its widest sense, is the result of all this? It means that the tropics are healthy. It means the opening up of a new continent for settlement by European civilization. Research has opened to our farmers a whole new world for colonization. Already the French, the Germans, the English and Belgians are pouring into Africa. We won't be dead before we see cattle coming down the Nile and putting the Chicago meat packers out of business! (Applause.)

From that indefinite time when primitive men are supposed to have wandered out from a birthplace somewhere in Central Asia, the history of our civilization is accompanied by the story of a constant succession of migrations westward. In the course of centuries, with increasing population, western and eastern civilizations have spread, until they have met again on the shores of the Pacific. Our Western civilization can go no further to the West; it is stopped by the shores of the Pacific Ocean. Since it can go no further to the West, if it is to increase, it must turn towards the tropics; and that is as true of the South Temperate Zone as it is of the North. Many times, already, has European civilization attempted to gain a foothold in the tropics and failed. In succession, the Phoenicians, Greeks, Romans, Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, British and French have attempted to found colonial communities in the tropics. For various reasons, though some were for a short time successful, all failed. Their failure it was that gave the tropics their reputation for unhealthiness. But modern research has proved that tropical unhealthiness is due practically entirely to the diseases that are peculiar to the tropics. Research has shown how to overcome those diseases, and so, the unhealthiness being removed, has opened the tropics to European colonization.

Why, then, should Germans not be able to get the place in the sun for which they are clamoring? What is to prevent the success of German tropical colonies?

The reasons why the tropics are unhealthy for German colonies are precisely those which have caused Germany to make war upon all European civilization other than her own.

Nothing is more certain than that, to-day, most instructed Germans believe that they fight with right on their side; they believe it because, for more than a generation, Germans have been taught to believe that they are the most perfect of the human race, and that in their culture civilization has reached

its highest development; believing this they are quite logical in their determination to prevail over, and in spite of, all who may lie in their way.

Let us examine what grounds there are for these assumptions. Are Germans physically better than other men? Scarcely; most of the heavyweight champions are Irish! (Laughter.) Intellectually, are they supremely superior? Decidedly not. The German would be the first to acknowledge that the highest faculty of human intelligence is the creation of new knowledge. What race has contributed most to the knowledge of mankind by its discoveries? A little poem, called "Not Germany," recently published in "Life," did a good deal to make the answer to that question better known.

The fact is, that astonishingly few of mankind's great discoveries have been German. Run over the list: Pasteur, Lister, Ross, Bruce, Reed, Morton, these names spring to the mind, as inseparably associated with the great advances in modern medicine; with the birth of the age of steam and machinery are connected those of Stephenson, Watt, Arkwright; in the sciences of chemistry and physics, and the application of scientific discoveries to the practice of everyday living, we have Bell, Volta, Faraday, Perkins, Avogadro. These are only a few of the names which jump at once to the lips of everyone. They are not German names. True, Helmholtz was a giant: but where are his companions? (Applause.)

It is true that there is an extraordinary thoroughness in German works of reference, and the excellence and organization of German teaching are unique. For that reason, for a generation, more of our students have gone to Germany for higher instruction than to any other country in the world; but the fact remains that, in spite of its opportunities and its many advantages, German intelligence has not been so productive of new knowledge as it should have been. You can realize this from your reading. If you don't believe it, go home and look at your works of reference; you will be surprised and proud to find how impossible it is for you to read for long on any subject without coming to some important British name. (Applause.)

This point is worth dwelling upon, for the reason that the Germans have never ceased to express such high appreciation of their own learned men, that most of us had come to believe that the last word on most questions was German. Young nations are prone to self-advertisement. They do it designedly, to foster a national pride; they must teach the ideals of patriotism; it is unnecessary for older nations to do so. You

must remember that Germany is a young country, organized in 1871 and, therefore, a whole century younger than the United States. The creation in Germany of an unflinching and absolute belief in German pre-eminence has been one of the greatest cares of the German Government. Proofs of it are everywhere in the speeches of German publicists, from the Kaiser downwards, and in German publications of every description.

Let me give you one instance of the working of that desire to insist upon the idea of national pre-eminence. In the early days of Bacteriology, when Pasteur was working in the institute with which the French Government supplied him, Koch was working in the Institute for Infectious Diseases, at Berlin, upon tuberculosis. The present Kaiser came to visit him. The Kaiser was exceedingly anxious that something should be produced in the German institution to offset the discoveries which were being given to the world from Paris. Koch told him of his hopes that a cure for tuberculosis might be found in tuberculin. The Kaiser ordered and insisted upon immediate publication. You all know the result of so mistaken a course: his premature announcement brought pain and disappointment to thousands who believed him and hoped for relief.

Since there is no proof that German bodies and German minds are better than those of other men, what is there in German culture to give it right of domination? How does it differ from our own? That very clamor by Germany for a place in the sun,—for colonies,—affords the best example of the essential differences between the culture of German civilization and our own.

Official Germany looks with longing eyes from her own densely settled country and rapidly increasing population to the enormous tracts of sparsely settled land over which France and Britain hold title. They have between them about one-quarter of the total land surface of the globe. To-day, Germania does not hesitate to assert her right to take, by force if need be, from those who have no present use for it, land needed by her people, and with it to form colonies.

There is something in the claim. There is not a Canadian who would deny land to a homesteader; but the German idea of a colony is not our idea. And because of that difference, German colonies cannot succeed.

Experience has told us that a colony exists only for the advantage of those inhabiting it, that free men will be free men, whether bred at home or abroad. (Applause.) Ger-

many, as a young nation, lacks experience, and has not imagination to profit by the experience of other people; she still holds to ideas we British learned a century and a half ago were wrong. She wants colonies in order that they may be tributary to and be a benefit to the home land.

In urging her plea for room for her increasing people, Germany deliberately ignores the fact that Germans are as free as are English, Scotch or Irish to become citizens in the colonies which enjoy independence under the ægis of Imperial Britain. She suppresses all knowledge of the thousands who have done so. Germany points, with tears in her eyes, to the millions of people of German descent who are citizens of the United States; and pretends that she has been peculiarly injured in their presence there. She has made so much noise about it that few would guess that if two represents the number of persons in the United States who came from, or of whom one parent came from, Germany, three represents the number of those of similar British origin; there are half as many again people of immediately British origin in the United States as of similar German descent!

Britain doesn't make any fuss about it; why should Germany? The reason is just this: simply because of the fundamental difference between the German theory of civilization and our own. For us, the State is an artifice designed to secure the wellbeing of the people in whom that State exists and has its being. For the Germans, the State has a personal existence apart from those composing it, and individuals exist only to secure its benefit. For us, our King—God bless him!—is an honest, hard-working man, trained in the traditions of worthy kingship. We acknowledge and honor him as the head of a State to which he, as well as ourselves, is subject. If all the British but himself were dead there would be no British Empire and Mr. George Guelph Wettin would be out of a job. (Laughter.) For the Germans, in theory as in fact, their Kaiser in himself has a personal and inherent right to direct, according to his wisdom, the destinies of the people who are his. If all the Germans were dead, Wilhelm, under divine approval, would still be *Deutscher Kaiser und Koenig von Preussen!* The German Empire would still exist, for Wilhelm is himself the State.

That is why the Hohenzollern and the Prussian nobles, with whose help he rules the German people, object to emigration. When a German leaves Germany, though it be for his own personal and individual benefit, the State suffers the loss of a man; in his emigration something in which the Kaiser

has a rightful property passes from the power of the German State. At the price of their necks, a Louis and a Charles abolished such appallingly mediæval ideas from France and from Great Britain!

Consider the conditions existing to-day in Germany as a result of these ideas. In 1862 Bismarck said to the Prussian King, "Be a Prussian, and rule!" In spite of the vote of a Parliament which had been elected on the basis of manhood suffrage and which voted 380 to 10 against him, the Prussian King, with Bismarck and the army at his back, ruled Prussia, collected the taxes, and ran the government without reference to the people, until in the course of time, after 1870, the people came to his way of thinking. Their opinion changed as a result of three deliberately designed and successful wars, against Denmark, Austria and France, and as a result of the miseducation of the German people by a most craftily carried on newspaper campaign. That campaign has continued from 1870 to the present day, both by everything that could be printed, and by the voice of men prominent in every phase of German life, it has had for object, self-avowed, the leading of the nation to a point where it would tolerate an assault on the British people; an assault designed solely for the sake of the material advantage which might be obtained from it; an assault planned precisely as the German robber barons planned their raids in the middle ages. If preparation and education during so many years, for such a purpose, seems deliberation too diabolical to be true, read current history. One of the best new books that the war has produced is "Britain's Case against Germany," by Ramsay Muir; in the Memoirs of Bismarck and of Hohenlohe, out of its own mouth does the German idea stand condemned!

As we have seen, in 1862 the Prussian King overrode the popular voice at the instigation of Bismarck. The organization of the new German empire in 1870 was designed and carried out, in large part, by that same Bismarck. It is not surprising that he made Prussia, and the Empire over which Prussia holds hegemony, an absolute autocracy. Bismarck placed absolute power in the hands of one man, the Emperor.

True, in form, the Germans have representative government. Their system provides for three representative bodies which are supposed to have governmental powers. The first of these, the Landtag, is something like a Provincial Legislature; but the people are elected to that by a vote allotted by the amount of income tax paid! In one town, for example, two men have the same right, in voting power, as two hundred

others, and there are in addition a large number of persons living in that district who have no vote at all. Poor men have about as much chance of making their opinions felt there as snowballs have in summer time. (Laughter.) A second elective body, the Reichstag, corresponds in some ways to the Dominion Parliament; but it has absolutely no power, and is nothing but a debating body. It is only a matter of a few months since that the Kaiser was advised to turn its members into the street by a squad of soldiers, because they ventured to express disagreement with governmental actions. The third representative body is a sort of Federal Council. It has fifty-eight members; but the Kaiser has himself the control of twenty of their votes, and he has never had any trouble in getting the two other votes necessary for a majority from the remaining States. This body meets in secret.

Is it necessary to go further? Could colonies governed by methods such as these succeed in this year of our Lord, in the tropics or anywhere else? Could any men who were not blinded by a vicious system of education and by misrepresentation, endure such a government?

There are lots of good men in Germany. Canada knows well how good the stock can be. Think of the men of thrifty, industrious Waterloo and Berlin; of Adam Beck and Kirchhofer. Consider the exodus of Germans who, from 1848 to 1850, and again in 1862, went from their country, many of them to Canada and to the United States, because they had failed to gain personal and political liberty at home.

Could men of this stock remain contented with the German system of government, once the larger life and freer air of a colony in a newly settled land had purged them of their education and awakened in them a sleeping sense of personal responsibility, of individual liberty?

The answer is plain; colonies of German men and women will succeed anywhere; but it is the German people who will succeed, and not the mediæval ideals by which some of them are still ruled and driven. (Applause.)

(March 1, 1915.)

The War, as Seen From the Far East

BY PROFESSOR A. P. COLEMAN, M.A., F.R.S.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club, held on the 1st March, Professor Coleman said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—Early in the winter, or rather at the end of the winter of the Southern Hemisphere, during the past year, the British Association was on its way to Australia. It is rather hard for us to think of winter as coming in August, but that is the case. Early in August, then, between two and three hundred members of the British Association, including people from other countries as well as Great Britain, were on board an Orient Liner, on their way to Adelaide, Australia. On the 5th we heard by wireless that Britain had made war on Germany, or put it the other way—Germany had made war on Britain. We had Germans amongst us, distinguished scientists, and some of them old friends of my own. We hardly knew what to think about it. Some said that it was impossible—that Germany and Britain were on too good terms. However, we found that it was not only possible, but that it was too true. When we landed at Adelaide, we learned how the war was already going on. We were about as far away from the centre of it as we could well be: of course New Zealand is the exact Antipodes of Great Britain, but Australia is about as far away as you can get. One might think that in so distant a country, set off between the seas, we should find all peaceful; yet the war did exist at that moment in Adelaide: the newspapers were full of it; every speech formally made before the British Association referred to it, but gravely and with deprecation, because we had German and Austrian guests with us, and we must not do anything to hurt their feelings. Officially, things were kept quiet. You have some idea here, I believe, of "Business as usual"; and there also the effort was made superficially to observe the same motto, and to have business go on as before

* Professor Coleman is head of the Department of Geology at the University of Toronto. He had just returned from a trip to the far East, having attended a Congress of Scientists in Australia. He was, therefore, able to give an intimate description of the conditions created in the far East by the war.

in Melbourne and Sydney. Though on the surface everything went on as though no change had taken place; yet there was an undercurrent of anxiety, as well as a general feeling that the British Empire was going to come through all right, and that they were going to help. That was the feeling of everybody. I had a chance as guest in friends' houses to see what the war meant to them.

In Australia nearly every large city is a seaport, and so felt the effect of the war as inland cities would not. You could not enter a harbor at night, you had to stand your distance, and enter only when there was a chance to see who you were and make sure of your identity. Then, too, you would find in the back of a harbor two or three German vessels, or sometimes four or five German vessels, laid up,—no more business done by them, the war meant a sudden cessation of their trade. German ships had a share almost equal to those of Great Britain in the far eastern steamship traffic, for the Nord-Deutscher Lloyd is quite the equal of the P. and O. lines; but all at once the German vessels were stopped. It was quite a striking thing.

I went with one of my old friends, Professor Penck, for a walk in the Botanical Gardens at Brisbane. We found three German ships lying there tied up in the harbor—I didn't look at him, nor he at me, but we went away! (Laughter.) You could see the effects of the war showing themselves there and generally everywhere.

When starting away, some of us had made arrangements to travel homewards by German ships; but now we could not get one!

I went to New Zealand—I am giving you just the high lights, you understand,—it would take too long to tell you all we did, and it would not be particularly interesting, but there were striking things in many places. For instance, when in Auckland, looking at their volcanoes,—they have some fine ones there—I saw a long troop of unkempt horses trotting along the streets; asking what they were for, I was told they were for the mounted troops of New Zealand. When we got off the ship at Wellington, the capital, we saw eight big liners painted grey, and with no names—they were now troopships, and British warships were waiting to convoy them.

All sorts of rumors were going about:—where was the Australian fleet?—you know they have a real fleet in Australia! (Applause)—nobody knew; everyone surmised that it was in the north, but the fleet and troopers from New Zealand were not idle:—German Samoa presently became British ter-

ritory, and the German part of New Guinea presently belonged to Australia—Australia already owned part of it, but now they added the German part just to the north. The Australians and New Zealanders were quietly doing this imperial work, but here you probably heard little about it or paid little attention to it.

We were wondering what Canada was doing all this time, and were anxious to hear, but there was nothing published, except this statement, which was given prominent headlines in the newspapers, that Canada was sending thirty thousand troops as a first contingent. People began to shake my hand then, and to think a little more of me than before. (Laughter.)

Leaving Australia, we were pretty well on the way northward when we learned that the German cruisers were beginning their depredations, among them the famous Emden. We had to cross to Thursday Island, a centre of the pearl industry, but as you don't wear pearls of course you don't know anything about Thursday Island. Now, there was no market for mother of pearl shells, for they all go to Vienna, so the Kanakas, the Japs and all the others interested in the pearl fishery, were out of work because of this world war.

We set out from that place for Singapore where all lines of travel in the far East meet, you know. Ours was a British ship, the "Mataram," bound for Java, and I was promising myself a nice little run through the island, but instead we started out across the Indian Ocean, and with light out, or screened, sailed along, a ghost ship, through the waters, until we came to Christmas Island, where we turned north. And so we saw nothing of the famous island of Java. The reason was, of course, the Emden. We gave out that we were going to Java, but we went somewhere else! (Laughter.)

On the way to Singapore, I was very much amused when standing beside the Captain, to see an approaching steamer suddenly dash off in another direction, but presently come back: they had thought we might be the Emden. We arrived at Singapore without seeing or hearing anything of the cruiser, since our wireless was dismantled for fear the Emden might get information.

In Singapore we found business was all at loose ends. There was no more sale for copra. You may imagine here that copra is not of much importance, but its production is the principal business there. Copra is the dried meat of the cocoanut, and its market is found mainly in Germany. At ordinary times the South Sea Islanders live comfortably on

the proceeds of the cocoanut, but there is no more sale for that now, the material is unsalable. It is just the same with the tin and rubber, so the inhabitants are all affected by the war.

Passing on from Singapore, we touched some points in the Straits Settlements, of which I suppose you have not heard much, but they are extraordinarily interesting. There are only a few thousand British there, planters and so on, the great bulk of the population being Malays and Chinese, who come in and often become prosperous planters, specially in Malacca. The British have inherited a good many things from other peoples, so that there is risk of jealousy on some points. It is to be remembered that Malacca was once Dutch, and looks Dutch to this day.

At length we came to Penang, arriving early one morning—we could not get in at night, you remember. We found there a feeling of dismay among the people, for a vessel had been sunk in the harbor, and its masts were still sticking up out of the water. The Emden had been there the night before! The masts were those of the Zhemtchug, a Russian cruiser, which had been anchored just about the place where we were. You know how the Emden came in at dawn, when things were dim, showing four smokestacks instead of three—the fourth put up on purpose to look like a British cruiser there which had four smokestacks. The Russians saw this vessel, but noticing the four smokestacks thought there was nothing wrong. The Emden came right alongside the cruiser before firing on her, and presently she sank, eighty-eight people being killed, and a hundred or more desperately wounded. The hospital was crowded with wounded Russians. All done in an instant almost!—it gives one a strange, uncanny idea of the force of modern explosives, to see how a big vessel could be destroyed in fifteen minutes. The wounded were soon picked up by sampans, but there were still dead bodies floating around—for it is the tropics, you remember,—shapeless masses which we almost came in contact with as we sat in the launch going ashore. On shore we found all in a state of disturbance. I had lost a knife, and wanted to buy one, so I went to an English shop—for there are English and Chinese shops there,—but the young man who waited on me could not stop to give me what I needed until he had told me all about the Emden's work. He had seen it. Another curious thing—when I bought the pen-knife, I found it was covered with vaseline, and wondered why, but was told that everything of steel in that tropical climate gets so rusted that they

have to keep it covered with vaseline. When I cleaned it up, and looked at it, I found it was marked "Made in Germany." (Laughter.)

As she left Penang, the Emden met a little French torpedo boat, the Mousquet, which was quickly sent to the bottom; but strangely enough two other French torpedo boats lying alongside the pier were overlooked. They had been there all the time, but the Emden never saw them! She had been informed of the presence of the Russian cruiser, which she immediately attacked, but had not heard of the French vessels. That, I suppose, is all that need be said about Penang. The presence of the Germans was brought very close to us.

I was on the way to India, on the Japanese ship, Suwa Maru, and the captain told us, "We will go on this evening." But we did not. Then he said we shall start in the morning; still we stayed there. And so we were delayed for nine days. The Emden had been collecting ships of every country, just as you collect postage stamps! She had a number of British ships, and had just got a French one, the little vessel I spoke of a moment ago, as well as the Russian cruiser, and it was said that she wanted a Jap vessel, so our Jap Captain was bound not to go out and be caught. On our way to Penang we must have passed the Emden within about fifty miles, steaming off into the deserts of the ocean, for a Jap cruiser was after her. Finally I got a ship, of the British India Company, which went to Burma and then another on to Calcutta.

What about India? It has always seemed to me the most attractive, yet mysterious country in the world. There had been reports of sedition, bomb explosions, etcetera, and it had seemed to me not entirely safe for white men, but when I called on some friends at the Geological Survey at Calcutta, they seemed quite unconcerned, and sent me north to Darjeeling, to see the Himalayas. Afterwards one of them took me through the heart of India, the jungly part where you see the wild animals come out to the fields of millet. When one watches those dark people going along the street, with their inscrutable faces, one wonders what they are thinking, at the bottom of their dark minds? You don't know; it is very unsafe to guess. Nevertheless, in Calcutta I found my friends taking everything colly. When you listened to them, you would think there was no trouble at all. The natives were all friendly, kindly, polite. I was amazed. But I found that the white man does not worry. He is not expecting a bomb. A bomb comes once in a long while, but he is not worried about it.

That is extraordinary. You must not forget that there are two hundred and forty to two hundred and fifty million people there, natives, who don't understand our views entirely, yet the civil service that rules over them consists of only twelve hundred men! Think of that—the fraction can hardly be expressed in decimals, of the Englishmen ruling that huge Empire! Yet it gives no trouble while this biggest war in the world's history is raging. I went to Jubbulpore, an important garrison city and a very interesting one; they told me there at the Club that all the white troops had gone to the war. Think of it! taking troops away in the midst of a war, and they felt there was no danger to the whites! I lost any little trepidation I might have had, and felt as much at home as one could when the faces were dark, and the climate was different, and all things were different from one's home surroundings.

More than that, I heard that the Nizam of So-and-So had offered fifty thousand pounds, or so many lacs of rupees, for the war; that the Prince of So-and-So was willing to send so many of his troops to the war. Everyone was joining in! (Applause.) The importance of that cannot be fully realized: instead of showing any sign of disaffection, they are sending troops to help us. You know, after all, decency and honesty count in the world. (Hear, hear, and applause.) There is no doubt India has been ruled in that way. No country in the world was ever ruled in a more kindly spirit. Sometimes there is a little rigidity—officials are sometimes that way—but everybody recognizes that honesty and uprightness of intention do much. The Indians themselves, even the disaffected ones, recognize that. They would not have any other country in the world rule them. Britain is the one they must cling to; so they are fighting for Britain now. (Applause.)

The question of India seemed to me very important. I went to Bombay, where the whites are not numerous; the merchants and higher classes being Parsees, and I was at Madras, where the Emden had flung in a shot or two a couple of weeks before. Some people had moved inland, but they came back, and Madras was going on with its business as before, because the Emden at that time was running for her life; and very soon we heard that an Australian cruiser, the Sydney, had smashed her at Cocos Island, which I had seen a few weeks before. (Applause.)

I had been in some of the most democratic parts of the Empire; I suppose New Zealand is the most democratic part, and Australia is nearly equal to it; and now I was in one of

the most autocratic parts of the Empire, among the millions and millions of Indians ruled by white men; but I found the same spirit everywhere. (Applause.) When I got back to Singapore—you have to go that way every time—I saw men going home from various parts of the East to take part in the war, among them a hundred and five men from Shanghai, fine young fellows—for that is far enough north to be healthy for white men. They were running about the ship for exercise every morning and leaping into the harbor for a swim, paying no attention to the sharks said to be there. It was a gathering of the clans; they were turning up from everywhere, and all on their way back to fight for the Empire. The Indians were anxious to join in. Why, the Empire is a unit now as it never was in the world before!

(Here Professor Coleman sat down, but the applause was so hearty and long continued as to amount to an encore, and President Lesslie Wilson rose and said, "I told Professor Coleman he stopped too soon," so the Professor stood up again and added):

Gentlemen, I have said the bulk of what I wanted to say, but there are a few things that might be added. I had intended to come home by the C.P.R. Line, for the C.P.R. boats are the fastest on the Pacific. (Hear, hear.) When I got back to Colombo I enquired about it, but learned to my discomfiture that there were no C.P.R. boats. What had happened? They were all taken for auxiliary cruisers or troopships! I had promised my colleagues who were doing my work on this side of the water that I would be back at my work soon, so I lost no time in looking for another ship. I found that there was a boat of the American Line, which took eight days more than the C.P.R., also a Japanese boat, which took about the same time. I came home by the American Line, as it started a little sooner than the Japanese. But what has the war got to do with American Liners? I thought I should feel at home on board the Korea, for after all we are part of the North American continent. But on the pier at Shanghai I noticed that the German language was everywhere in evidence. German flags were displayed, there were German "Hochs" and German accents everywhere. After we left Shanghai I found that we had a hundred and fifty Germans on board, and German was the language of the ship! German the language of the ship? That rather puzzled me, and I made enquiries. They were refugees from Kiao Chau, all women and children except two or three medical men, going back to Germany! Their husbands could not go with them;

they could not reach home that way. The Japanese are in Kiao Chau now, and the Germans can never go back there again! So we have the reverse side of the war, the pathetic side. There was a nice little German four-year-old girl that used to come and see me in my stateroom; she seemed to like to do so as I talk a little German, but am still a pretty good Britisher, I hope! (Laughter.) It was interesting to hear that child say, "Mein Vater ist im Kriege!" with great pride. That is their side of it. They think they are right. But the common people are suffering for it, the peasants are feeling it everywhere. The whole of German business has gone to pieces in the world,—a great and prosperous country has now no foreign business—the whole thing has vanished before the power of the British navy, and here these poor refugees were going home to meet what the war has brought to them! (Applause.)

(March 8, 1915.)

The Gospel of Force

BY R. C. SMITH, K.C.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club, held on the 8th March, Mr. Smith said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—With so cordial an introduction, it is difficult for me to divine whether this applause is owing to your sitting down or my rising. (Laughter.) I am delighted to be here to-day, sitting near to "Boanerges" (laughter) and to my *brother-in-law*, Mr. Justice Riddell. (Laughter.) Toronto is proverbially a hospitable city, and if one has the reputation of being a half decent sort of general "mixer," as they say I am, his friends rally around him to help him out. And I assure you I have not been without suggestions as to what I should say to you to-day, and—I think you will allow me the Hibernianism—particularly as to what I should *not* say. An officer of the Montreal Home Guard met me last week; we had both been out at dinner—at any rate I was at a very quiet dinner (laughter),—he had dined not wisely but too well. I asked him how the Home Guard movement was getting along. He replied: "The Home Guard—hic—is getting along—hic—very well—hic; but the commanding officer—hic—has no sinecure; he has got about three thousand men—hic—and what the devil can he do—hic—with three thousand s'gestions every day?" (Laughter.)

One of the first and most imperative suggestions as to what I should not say, was: "I wouldn't say anything about the Home Guard, if I were you; you know you don't know anything about the Home Guard, you can't know anything about it, and you will botch the whole thing if you refer to the Home Guard." There is enough human nature in me that when anyone tells me I must not refer to any subject, there immediately arise intellectual and moral reasons why I should refer to that particular subject. (Laughter.) So if you, sir, will kindly before I sit down remind me, I will say one or two things about the Home Guard. (Laughter.)

* Mr. R. C. Smith, K.C., is one of the leaders of the Bar in his native City, Montreal, and has been Professor of Commercial Law at McGill University for several years. As a speaker he enjoys a continental reputation.

Now to come to the war. I think no one who thinks and reads has any difficulty in agreeing with the leading thinkers in neutral countries in fixing the responsibility for this most inexcusable and dastardly war the world has ever seen, upon the German ruler and his immediate military advisers. (Hear, hear.) When some seven or eight years ago he was "disciplined," may I say? by his Chancellor, and warned that he should not again speak in a manner to involve the public policy of Germany, his pride was wounded, and from that moment he rid himself of everything progressive and liberal among his advisers, and deliberately surrounded himself with Ministers amenable to his desire. So it is utterly useless to say that the policy of Germany is not his policy. The attempt of England and Russia together to secure forty-eight hours' delay, in order that the resources of civilization might prevent such a catastrophe as the trouble between Austria and Russia threatened to cause,—was defeated by German influence. All these things fix the primary and immediate responsibility for the war upon the Kaiser and his military advisers.

But to-day there is no doubt that the German nation is practically behind the Kaiser. It would be folly to close our eyes to it. Is that accounted for upon the naked principle of patriotism, or is there something else to account for it? History abounds in examples of peoples and nations rallying to the support of their Governments without very much reference to the moral merits of the war, or even to the manner in which it is carried on. But the Germans were a thinking people. Some people say that though they were a thinking people their thinking was rather abstract, rather dreamy, rendering them open to conviction even by error or by half truth. I am not going to discuss that, but we must admit that they are a thinking people, and we must admit that to-day this thinking people is practically a unit behind the ferocious military oligarchy that controls the nation.

It seems to me that two things are principally responsible for this strange, and I may say strangely terrible spectacle. Immediately after the war of 1870 a propaganda was begun in Germany to the effect that the war was a victory of German culture; that German culture was the only culture that was cosmopolitan, that was adapted to every race and every condition of men. The doctrine of Nietzsche, of the survival of the fittest among nations, I suppose, was in reality the origin of the later shocking development in that teaching. His theory was simply founded upon this, that the stronger nation will survive, that the weaker nation will not

only disappear and go to the wall, so to speak, but that this is in the working out of the development of the laws of nature itself. It was a long cry from that very doubtful doctrine to the doctrines of Treitschke, Bernhardt, and their apologist, Professor Münsterberg, and others who followed later on. Even Nietzsche, who is generally classed with these—what shall we call them? apostles of frightfulness,—even Nietzsche repudiated the idea that the victory of 1870 was a victory for culture. He said, "Germany will make a grand escape after that victory if it does not turn out a national defeat! if she does not sacrifice the German mind to the German empire." And he concluded a most learned article on the subject in the words I quote: Goethe said, "It may be centuries before it can truly be said of us that we are far removed from barbarians," and he added: "German culture will survive, because French culture will live, and German culture will depend upon French culture in the future, as it has in the past." (Applause.)

That, however, did not prevent the development of this idea that in German efficiency, German uniformity, there was the salvation of the human race. And it did not prevent the current idea that the State represented force, that as German culture was appropriate for the world at large, it was the duty of the State as representing power, to impose that culture upon the world. Therefore the doctrine progressed. The State is the "Ee-all" and the "End-all," and the individual has no rights against the State. The State is the custodian of power. Now that power is for the purpose of supporting what is German throughout the world. And we find its culmination in the frequent declarations of the Kaiser himself, that to Germany there are but two alternatives, world power or absolute ruin."

Now this doctrine of force, which has eliminated morals from politics altogether, is what has taken possession of the German people, and it is that which is responsible for this strange spectacle of a one time introspective and reflective people standing behind so unpardonable a crime as this war now ravaging the world. (Applause.)

We talk a great deal in general terms about the gospel of force. I am going to take the liberty, with your permission, of reading just a few sentences, of the words of German thinkers, of their philosophers, who represent the prevailing, current, dominant thought of Germany to-day,—a few words illustrating what this doctrine means, and to what frightful lengths it has gone. Lest I should be accused of making a

selection in a partisan spirit, I shall quote selections made by two Americans. One is the Hon. J. M. Beck, formerly Assistant Attorney-General of the United States. I understand he is to address you shortly? If so, I am glad I got here first. (Laughter.)

He gives a preparatory outline of the doctrine of Machiavelli that was at one time repudiated by every thinker in the world; repudiated by Shakespeare in "The Merry Wives of Windsor." Machiavelli had become a byword for all the world, and his teaching scouted in the politics of every civilized nation.

This synopsis of the doctrine of Machiavelli, was taken from Symonds, the historian of the Renaissance, in "The Age of the Despot": "Machiavelli was the first in modern times to formulate the theory of government in which the interests of the rulers are alone regarded; a separation between statecraft and morality, which recognizes force and fraud among the legitimate means of attaining high political ends, which makes success alone the test of conduct, and which presupposes the corruption, baseness and venality of mankind at large."

Mr. Beck then selects a few sentences from Treitschke, in his lectures on "Politik." "Indeed Treitschke," in his lectures on *Politik*, which have become the gospel of Junkerdom, avowedly based his gospel of force upon the teaching of Machiavelli, for he points out that it was Machiavelli who first clearly saw that the State is power (*der Staat ist Macht*). Therefore, "to care for this power is the highest moral duty of the State," and "of all political weaknesses that of feebleness is the most abominable and despicable; it is the sin against the holy spirit of politics." He therefore holds that the State, as the ultimate good "cannot bind its will for the future over against other States," and that international treaties are therefore only obligatory "for such time as the State may find to be convenient."

Thus Treitschke actually gives credit for the origin of this theory openly and avowedly to Machiavelli. Then he goes on to speak of war as "an ordinance set by God"; quoting the words of Bernhardi, that it is "a biological necessity," and that "the living God will see to it that war shall always recur as a terrible medicine for humanity." Therefore, he argues, "might is at once the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitration of war," and war must give a "biologically just decision." (Sensation.)

Could anything be more inhuman, more brutal, than these aptly, cleverly chosen words, a "biologically just" result? In

other words, the weaker nation shall be crushed and bled and slaughtered by the stronger nation, and it is to be said after a deliberately provoked war, before Almighty God, that this is a biologically just decision!

Treitschke says and the statement is quoted by Bernhardi with approval, that "the End-all and Be-all of a State is power, and he who has not mind enough to look this truth in the face should not meddle with politics." To this Bernhardi adds that the State's highest moral duty is to increase its power, and in so doing, "the State is the sole judge of the morality of its own action. It is in fact above morality, or, in other words, whatever is necessary is moral."

Following this out, we have one more quotation from Bernhardi: "The State is a law unto itself. Weak nations have not the same right to live as powerful and vigorous nations." Then he goes on: "As to war, the powerful nation must not watch for a legitimate *casus belli*, but justify a deliberately provoked war." Then follow these words: "The happiest results have followed deliberately provoked wars. The prospects of success are brightest when the moment for declaring war can be selected in the interests of the political and military situation." These are the words quoted, and used by Bernhardi, a representative writer, and one most frequently quoted with approval, not nominally, but in sentiment, by the Kaiser himself.

Now one more—I won't burden you with the numerous quotations I might give you. I take this from Prof. Powys' little book "The War and Culture." It also is from Bernhardi: "The Christian idea of sacrifice for something higher does not exist for the State—for there is nothing higher than it in the world's history; consequently it cannot sacrifice itself to something higher." I am no preacher, nor the son of a preacher, nor am I worthy to preach, sir; but I believe in my conscience that the words of the lowly Nazarene will govern this world when Kaiser and Krupp are forgotten in ages of contemptible oblivion! (Applause.)

So, following out this idea, that the stronger nation is justified in making war upon the weaker nation, and that it need not justify itself, nor wait for any cause, we find that the German party had been preparing for years and years; the time had come; the naval policy was completed; the Kiel Canal was opened on the 1st of July; the clock of time had struck! Russia did everything in her power to preserve the peace; she went as far as any self-respecting nation could. The French tried to avert the catastrophe, and could not believe it

possible—not until President Poincaré asked the German Ambassador who had demanded his passport, "Is this absolutely irrevocable? Can civilization find no solution?" The Ambassador answered, "I am sorry to say it is." "Then," Poincaré replied, "France will endeavor to meet the situation as becomes her honor!" In five minutes every bell in Paris was ringing.

Then we were told, "We have a treaty with you that we have bound ourselves to observe; we have guaranteed the neutrality of Belgium by a solemn treaty in 1839, and lest there should be any doubt about it we reaffirmed it in 1911, and 1913, and we even acknowledged it in this year of grace 1914; but we don't propose to stand by it! We undertook with you to guarantee the neutrality of Belgium, but that does not apply to a time of war!"

"Neutrality!" What does "neutrality" mean? "Neutrality" means that there are belligerents somewhere! That neutrality of Belgium can well take care of itself in times of peace. The treaty is made for a time of war. The impudence and insolence of the statement that the exigencies of war absolved them from observing that treaty constituted the most formal challenge to war that any nation ever received! A treaty makes law between nations. If that law be displaced nothing but resort to arms remains. And Germany could not have declared war in any more deliberate way than when she said, "There is your treaty! We shall trample upon it. Do whatever you can!"

I was told the other day that, "England is the last country in the world that would go to war for a principle. England's necessities did not require her to go to war. But being chivalrous for a weak nation, she entered into the war." Supposing she did. We might have had a worse cause. But what are called questions of principle,—if you analyze them, do they not involve the nation's most sacred, vital interests? (Hear, hear.) We were in effect told then, that there were two alternatives open to England. After a thousand years of glorious history, during which the British flag has been respected the world over." Either step down to the position of a third class Power, or say as Sir Edward Grey did, in words that shall be memorable in our history, in answer to Germany's insolence: "Since Germany must have war, she shall have it in full measure!" (Applause.)

And then, sir, we awoke to the consciousness that a friendly Power, that had been frequenting the Mother Land and all her great Dominions, making fortunes among us, receiving

kindness and courtesy everywhere, had actually been at war with us for years! That she had been building concrete bases in our sleeping cities, and had been employing a system of espionage so contemptible that it meant a conspiracy against friendly feeling, a conspiracy against civilization itself! (Hear, hear.)

How was this declaration of force, this translation of doctrine into deeds,—how was it met by our Empire? The first thing that it has brought out, is the great, magnificent unity of the Empire. (Hear, hear, and applause.) In the trying moments, when the Government was carrying that frightful weight of responsibility, most strenuous political contentions were being carried on. Several questions divided the different parties in England, and the Government, with these dissensions at home, and political contests carried on with acrimony more severe than ever characterized English politics,—in one moment, sir, a “change comes over the spirit of their dreams.” I will read, so you may have the simple wording of it, a letter written on August 2nd by Mr. Bonar Law to the Premier Mr. Asquith:

“Dear Mr. Asquith: Lord Lansdowne and I feel it our duty to inform you that in our opinion, as well as in that of all the colleagues whom we have been able to consult, it would be fatal to the honor and security of the United Kingdom to hesitate in supporting France and Russia at the present juncture; and we offer our unhesitating support to the Government in any measures they may consider necessary for that object. Yours very truly, A. Bonar Law.” (Hear, hear.)

Simple but sublime! A “scrap of paper,”—but symbolizing the unity, and therefore the mighty power, of the Empire! (Applause.)

And so the Dominions over seas. Even South Africa—you remember, a few years ago, when it was questioned whether free government should be given to South Africa, many sincere people believed that to grant responsible government to the Boers in South Africa would be fraught with tremendous national danger. But free British institutions were granted; we trusted them, gave them free government; and the man who had been a leader of the forces against the Crown became Prime Minister. Will their loyalty stand the test? It was not long before that test was applied, and applied in a supreme manner. Will it stand the test of crushing out rebellion even among its own flesh and blood? But from the south there came back to the Mother Land, to the great Dominions throughout the world, to Germany above all, the inspiring

truth, that loyalty is even greater and higher than ties of flesh and blood! (Applause.) And the man who had been our enemy takes the field and leads the forces to crush out rebellion! He has planted the flag in Africa more firmly than ever before, and sent back word to England: "You have trusted us, and we have kept the faith!" (Applause.)

The Empire that can so co-ordinate the growth of the social and political life of these far remote dependencies, has not even begun to grow old! The dew of the morning is still upon her brow. She can look forward over the clouds of to-day to the brightness of to-morrow, beyond the sorrow and the sacrifice,—beyond the valor and the victory, to the centuries in which she shall be able to still maintain and prosecute her divinely appointed destiny of spreading throughout the world the principles of constitutional government and of civil and religious liberty. (Applause.)

I had intended to say something on the Monroe Doctrine. (Hear, hear.) But now I see my time has expired, and I know you are busy men, and have to go back—(Cries of "No, no!" and "Go on!"). I referred when speaking before a Canadian Club to the observations ex-President Taft made to the Outlook Club in New Jersey. His analysis of the Monroe Doctrine was simple, and was absolutely correct. Since then he has had the opportunity of speaking to you here. All that he then said was, that the Monroe Doctrine would not prevent an invasion of Canada, nor the exaction of an indemnity in case the Germans were victorious.

There is a great deal of misapprehension about the Monroe Doctrine. The words in which the Monroe Doctrine was promulgated by President Monroe in his Presidential address in 1823 are these:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and other Powers, to declare, that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European Power, we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the Governments which have declared their independence, and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on careful consideration, and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling, in any other manner, their destiny, by any European Power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States."

That is the Monroe Doctrine; there is nothing more in it. There is no writer on international law who supports the Monroe Doctrine upon any principles of law. I am sure my honorable friend to my right would bear me out in that. The Monroe Doctrine does not repose upon any principle of international law; it is not defended by any writer on international law. It is a declaration of American policy, that is effective, like a blockade, only so long as they make it effective. It is a declaration of the policy the Americans intend to pursue. You can't say anything more of it than that.

Speaking at Ottawa, I referred to the Monroe Doctrine. Last week I had the honor of meeting some prominent people in New York, who said to me, "You were a little snippy, in repudiating American help." "I was not aware," I replied, "that anything I said had been reported to you." "Oh, yes," they said, "it was reported. Of course it is right, but you might put it a little more gently." (Laughter.) "I think," I said, "I can recall the words I used, and I will repeat them for you now." I said this: "We would welcome the assistance of our great neighbor, but the Monroe Doctrine no thinking Canadian could for one instant rely upon." I said this further, gentlemen: "There is no protectorate over Canada. There is no suzerainty over Canada. When there is, and as soon as there is, the flag will have to be changed upon our public buildings. (Hear, hear.) Up to the present, we are satisfied with the flag that we have, and every Canadian, without any distinction, without reference to racial origin, creed or anything else, every Canadian is prepared to defend that same old flag." (Applause.)

I told them we could not rely upon the Monroe Doctrine; we must defend ourselves; we must defend this portion of the Empire. We value very highly the words and expressions and feelings of friendship and sympathy that we have received from all sides from our American friends. The honorable Judge to my right and I had the honor to be the guests of the State of New York on the occasion of the celebration of the hundred years of peace between the United States and the Empire, and the expression then of sympathy from representative people from all over that country, was certainly cheering and interesting to us. (Hear, hear.) We had their Secretary of State for the Navy, Mr. Daniels, who said, "I am here representing the Government of the United States, and I have to be extraordinarily careful in what I utter. I have my own opinion, and you have yours; and your opinion does not differ from my own, (laughter) and that opinion is

that we have no use for militarism!" (Applause.) I am quite sure Mr. Justice Riddell was not offended. I wasn't. (Laughter.) I didn't think that he referred to Kitchener's "contemptible army" (laughter); I didn't think he referred to the army from England and the volunteers from the various portions of the Empire. Kitchener's "contemptible army" has long since outlived that adjective, even in the mind of the unhappy monarch who so described it.

We value the expressions of sympathy from the United States, sincere on their part, but we have the duty of defending this portion of the Empire. Now this is the proper time to refer to the Home Guard. (Laughter and applause.) I am only going to say this, that those who originated it and those who joined it deserve credit; it is an honor to them. (Hear, hear.) And every man in the country should so regard it. (Applause.) And I am very pleased indeed to note that in a few days a Bill will be introduced at Ottawa recognizing the Home Guard and giving it a proper standing as a branch of His Majesty's forces. (Hear, hear.) It means something for men many of whom have passed their first youth (laughter)—I have almost passed it myself—it means something for them to join this movement, and the country should certainly regard them as patriotic sons of Canada; and we should wish them well in this movement, which should be given the unity and cohesion necessary to a military force. This Act, which will come before the House in a few days, will give this element. It is a patriotic movement, and it will go on conquering and to conquer. I think I have got over the Home Guard all right! (Laughter.)

Everyone asks, when will this thing be over? This is a war of liberty, if ever there was a war of liberty. But the English idea of liberty and the German idea of liberty are different. May I read you a few words from the great German poet, Heinrich Heine: "The Englishman loves liberty as his lawful wedded wife, the Frenchman as his loving mistress, the German loves her as an old grandmother, consigned to a remote place in the kitchen, never quite forgotten, but not brought forward very prominently into the light."

This is a war of liberty. We thought that the battles of liberty were over. When will this war be over? Not too soon, I hope! A patched-up peace would mean untold disaster for the future. (Hear, hear.) If you wish me to give my answer, I cannot do better than give you that answer in the words of the Prime Minister of England, uttered at the Guild Hall banquet, and repeated almost textually by him in

the House of Commons one week ago to-day—he has not changed his view.

“We shall not sheathe the sword which we have not lightly drawn until Belgium recovers in full measure more than all that she has sacrificed; until France is adequately secured against the menace of aggression; until the rights of the smaller nationalities of Europe are placed on an unassailable foundation; until the military domination of Prussia is fully and finally destroyed. That is the great task, worthy of a great nation. It means for its accomplishment that every man among us, old or young, rich or poor, busy or leisured, learned or simple, should give what he has and do what he can.”

That is the task which we have undertaken, and it is the task which we must accomplish. (Hear, hear.) And what after all? We shall have the centuries of peace to develop our own ideals, our own thoughts, our own poetry, our own mode of life. And above all, our progress in all shall be consolidated and inspired by liberty. We shall not have imposed upon us the hideousness of cosmopolitan culture, drummed into us by the taskmasters of Germany. We shall live our lives, and the smaller nations shall live theirs. What is pure, good, idiomatic, what comes from the souls of the people, in invention, in poetry, and in art, the expression of the souls of the smaller as well as of the great nations,—we shall have free development, free growth of them all. And we shall above all, as I say, have this, the inspiration of freedom. The old principles for which this nation has fought through many bloody seas, and on many far-flung battle lines, are still to be the inspiration of mankind, the principles of truth, liberty, and justice! (Applause.)

In the words of the American poet, Whittier:

“But life shall on and upward go;
The eternal step of progress beats
To the grand anthem, calm and slow,
That God repeats.

Take heart! The waster builds again
A charmed life old goodness hath.
The tares may perish, but the grain
Is not for death

God works in all things; all obey
His first propulsion from the night.
Wake thou, and watch! The world is grey
With morning light!” (Long applause.)

(March 15, 1915.)

The Reconstruction of Belgium After the War

BY DR. CHARLES SAROLEA, K.O.L.*

DR. CHARLES SAROLEA, representative of the King and Government of Belgium, was tendered an ovation on entering the hall at the regular meeting of the Club, on the 15th March, and again on rising to address the Club was greeted with long applause. He said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I shall have the great honor to-morrow night to address a meeting of your fellow citizens on "The Martyrdom of Belgium." This afternoon I shall, therefore, divert your attention from the tragic happenings in my native country to anticipations of the future.

Before I enter on the subject of the reconstruction of Belgium, it is well, however, that I should impress upon you the fact that it is future—this reconstruction of Belgium is not yet! On every occasion I impress upon audiences who have not got in touch, have not got familiar, with Belgian facts—I impress this other fact, that the worst is still to come for Belgium. For us, for Great Britain, even for France, the worst is over. I don't think that we shall ever have to pass again through the anxiety, the agony, which we went through in the second half of August and in September. For us the worst is over; the future is certain! (Applause.) For Belgium there is still a very tragic future in store. Every blow aimed at Germany for the next few months will be at the same time a blow aimed at Belgium. Every victory of ours will have to be paid for by additional suffering on the part of the Belgian people. That is absolutely inevitable! We know it in Belgium, and we are prepared for it!

What is going to happen when our victorious armies drive the German hordes out of Belgium? Those hordes will be driven back into Belgium again, and until the end Belgium

* Dr. Charles Sarolea is one of Belgium's most famous sons. He has long been associated with academic work, and is on the staff of the Department of French in the University of Edinburgh. He is perhaps best known as an author and lecturer, and among other activities finds time to discharge the duties of Belgian Consul in Edinburgh.

will remain the main theatre of war. The Germans may be eventually expelled from Belgium, but it will be a very hard military job; and the object can only be attained at a cost of the complete destruction of whatever remains of Belgium!

The Germans for the last six months have entrenched themselves, have fortified themselves, in almost impregnable positions. Even such beautiful and peaceful cities as Brussels have become fortified cities. The Germans will have to be bombarded out of every city of Belgium which has not been destroyed yet, and in the process of bombardment the German vandals, as well as our own artillery, will complete the work of destruction. That is the tragedy in front of Belgium for the next few months; and there may be more to follow!

You know that the German Huns have revived in this war one of the most atrocious practices of savage warfare: they have used, systematically and consistently—I have seen it myself!—they have used women and children as living shields, living screens, to protect them from Belgian and French and British artillery! I have seen Germans, having to cross a bridge, put a troop of sixty men and women, civilians, in front of them, and thus advance! That has been their systematic practice. Now it just would seem as if it were the thought of the German hordes to use the whole of Belgium, the whole Belgian people, as a living screen, a living shield, by which they will cover their retreat.

And perhaps do they expect that even the Allies should hesitate, if this war were to be protracted for a very long time,—that the Allies would hesitate to give up the whole of Belgium to complete destruction. So then we should well impress upon our minds this fundamental fact, that the tragedy of Belgium is not over, the worst is still to come. It is all the more necessary for us, therefore, speaking for the Belgians, to divert our thoughts from the haunting vision of sufferings to-day and the sufferings to-morrow to the anticipations of the future.

As for the remote future, I don't think there is one Belgian who has any doubt. (Applause.) We know—(applause)—we know that a new Belgium, a greater Belgium, a nobler Belgium, will arise from the ruins. (Hear, hear, and applause.) And speaking to citizens in a great country which is essentially a country of hope, that always looks forward to the future, I can assure you that to-day there is that sentiment, that instinct, in common between Canada and Belgium: they are both, Belgians and Canadians, thinking mainly in terms of the future. (Hear, hear.)

And therefore I do not think it is premature or irrelevant for me to-day to discuss with you the future of Belgium—the reconstruction of Belgium. Of course it is a formidable problem, and it is really impossible in one half hour even to touch the fringe of it. Of course there is the problem of material reconstruction: the whole of Belgium will have to be rebuilt. Belgium also in that respect is like Canada, for the West is a new country,—but with this difference, it is far more difficult to build in a new country which is also an old country than to build on the prairie. Thousands of villages razed to the ground have to be rebuilt; our cities have to be rebuilt; our farms have to be restocked. But what is far more important, what is even more difficult, is the reconstruction of our trade and industry, to which I shall come presently.

To come back to the problem of material reconstruction, of course, as you know, irreparable damage has been done to our ancient cities. The monuments sacred to art and religion, memorials of an ancient and glorious civilization, as at Ypres, you cannot rebuild,—one of the sublime monuments of architecture of the Middle Ages. Irreparable loss has been done: we shall not attempt to minimize it.

With regard to the material rebuilding of our cities on modern plans, that will only involve a huge amount of capital; and that will only involve this difficulty, that for some years to come it may be very difficult to find the necessary capital. So much destruction will have been accomplished all over Europe that every nation will require all the available capital. And capital will go much more abundantly to the remunerative fields of new countries than to old countries.

With regard to the rebuilding of our trades and industries,—that will present problems much more difficult to solve than the problems of material reconstruction. Remember that before the war Belgium was the most thickly populated country of the world! Little Belgium had a population superior to the whole population of the Dominion of Canada, over eight millions, and that population might only be supported because the Belgian people had built up a very complex and artificial fabric of trade and industry. Many of those trades were trades of luxury—the lace industry of Malines, the fashions of Brussels, the tourist industry, the crystal and glass industry of Liège, the horticulture and market gardening of early vegetables,—all luxuries. These industries, artificial in their nature, and being luxuries, will not be rebuilt so easily or so immediately after the war.

Of course we are constantly told that the huge indemnity that we are given to expect from Germany will solve this difficulty. I am rather skeptical about this German indemnity; at any rate this indemnity will not solve the problem within the future immediately following the war. At present there are perhaps a million Belgian refugees in acute distress. These people cannot remain in Holland, France, Great Britain, living on the charity of the world. Until the German indemnity is paid, that cannot be affected by any compensation from the German indemnity.

Let us take—we have several distinguished representatives of the press here,—they will understand the position,—let us take the Belgian newspaper press: Belgium, like this country, had a very numerous, and on the whole a very enterprising and prosperous press. These Belgian newspapers of course to-day as enterprises are ruined. How are these going to be re-established? Is a newspaper press going to be subsidized by Germany? Can you have a subsidized press grow out of the German indemnity? I confess I am afraid of a newspaper press that receives support in the form of a subsidy.

But the complex artificial fabric of trade and industry cannot be rebuilt by the German indemnity. We must rebuild it by private enterprise, by private capital. We must not expect magic results that this German indemnity is going to give.

But there is a much more serious consideration we need to be reminded of: it is this, that after the war, as before, Belgium to some extent will be dependent on Germany economically. As you know, geographically Germany is the hinterland of Belgium. Before the war Antwerp was a German port. All our Belgian seaside places, Nieuport, Ostend, etc., are German resorts.

If Germany had only waited, Belgium would almost inevitably have become a part of the German Staats-Verein. Belgium was more and more coming within the economic dependency of Germany. Of course, after the war, this we confidently hope, we shall shake off that Teutonic dependency. (Hear, hear, and applause.) Of course, let us not be overconfident; let us not minimize the difficulties in the way.

In the first place, Belgium is and always will be to some extent interconnected economically with Germany and Austria. I would even go farther: the prosperity of Belgium is even bound up to some extent with the prosperity of Central Europe,—to some extent, not wholly. There can be no doubt that if Belgium had only listened to the dictates of commer-

cial interest, Belgium would have allowed the German armies to pass through its territory, and become a part of the German Empire. To put the matter on the low level of commercial interest—you will excuse me if I use that expression, the low level of economic and commercial interest, because when I am addressing audiences of business and professional men they are generally not ready to admit that commerce stands any lower than other interests,—but to put the matter on this plane, there can be no shadow of doubt that it would have been to the commercial interest of Belgium to have been incorporated in the German Empire. Belgium, if she had come to terms with Germany, would have remained a self-governing country under the suzerainty of Germany, and Belgium would have shared in the economic expansion of the German Empire. It is almost certain, because Belgium would have been the richest part of that ideal German confederation, that Belgium would probably have been the most prosperous, the most flourishing vassal State of the magnificent Pan-Germany. But of course Belgium, as you know, has not for one moment listened to the dictates of commercial interests. (Applause.) But the fact remains that these commercial interests are there all the same. The geographical factor remains; you cannot eliminate it; we must take it into account in all our future calculations. And it will not be an easy matter.

We shall do our utmost, you may be sure, to eliminate Germany in the future from our trade. This is Great Britain's great opportunity, a unique opportunity in your history. In one moment Great Britain, the British Empire, can establish itself firmly, both economically and politically, upon the continent of Europe, having Belgium as its centre. (Applause.)

At present, of course, the Belgian people feel that the whole future is bound up with the future of Great Britain. (Hear, hear.) There is nothing which a Belgian patriot desires more earnestly than that in the future there should be brought about the most intimate and closest possible connection, politically and economically, between Belgium and Great Britain. (Applause.) And remember, that the opportunity, while it is with us to-day, may not be with us ten years hence, if we don't take advantage of it. We talk very glibly to-day of the capture of German trade. We assume that it will be the easiest thing in the world for the British Empire, for Great Britain, to establish itself economically in Belgium. It will not be an easy task; it will be a very difficult task, because of these economic and geographical factors; and another thing—Germany after the war will be as dangerous as, if not more

dangerous than, to-day. The paradox of the war, it seems to me, to-day, is this tragic paradox, that we are fighting not only to make Europe free, we are fighting not only to make America free—although America does not understand it (applause)—my American friends have repeatedly told me, "What is Hecuba to me?"—we are fighting also, and this is the tragic paradox of this war, to liberate the German people! (Hear, hear.) Millions of Canadian, Prussian, Russian, French, British soldiers are dying on the battle fields of the world, of Europe, in order to make the German people free!

And what is going to be the result? Supposing,—I am only assuming—it might be distant, but it is certainly likely, that the German people are free; will they be less efficient economically or more? I would assume that a free people is more efficient economically than a people which is enslaved. But another factor is this: the German people will retain, even after the war, all the magnificent qualities of efficiency and organization. They will be impoverished, but they will be ambitious. And you know there is no more dangerous competitor in trade than a very ambitious rival, who wants to work up his way. And therefore I seem to feel that this task of capturing German trade will not be quite as easy a task as some of our British friends imagine.

I have tried to be a prophet in previous years. I have been maligned as a prophet of evil; I don't want to be a prophet of evil again. But I am just afraid that if we do not apply to this task the same qualities of organization, efficiency, and education, which have made Germany so formidable, we shall not succeed. And then, if we don't succeed, we Belgians shall again be the victims, again fall under the heel of Germany, again—who knows? twenty or thirty years hence, then in a most subtle way again be in the grip of a people whom we shall respect in future, but whom we can never love, because the German and the Belgian temperaments can never get on together.

In the face of the problem, is Great Britain going to realize her opportunity? Is Canada going to join in this work of reconstruction? I know Canada will not be able to do much. Canada is doing the best she can for us; she is doing the greatest service, and the best she can render. The best Canada can do for us now is to fight for us. (Hear, hear, and applause.) And that is what Canadian people have done and are doing heroically. In the future we do not and cannot expect Canadian capital can be applied to the reconstruction of Belgium. All available capital will be needed by Canada. But Canada

can help us a very great deal. What we shall need in the future is that spirit of hope, of enterprise, of initiative, which distinguishes the Canadian people. Let the Canadian people, the Canadian managers and captains of industry, come to us and help us to rebuild our industries. Let Belgians come to Canada, to imbibe here that spirit of initiative and enterprise.

I am afraid after the war we shall have too much of the spirit of paternalism, shall expect too much from the German Government, and there will be great danger that the spirit of independence and initiative may be undermined. In Belgium we are all trying to do our best to anticipate future developments; yet we shall have the danger of paternalism and protectionism, and if we are to overcome this it will be by the spirit of independence and initiative which is the great characteristic of the Canadian people.

I may tell you,—and I am not committing any indiscretion,—we are going to establish in the Capital of Belgium, a great educational institution, I hope, a British-American University, a great international school of politics and economics, and we hope in that great school we shall have a Canadian section. (Applause.) You will excuse me for saying I do believe in education, and this war should convince us of the supreme force of education; this war is largely on the German side a professors' war. Germany has educated her people for forty or fifty years and prepared them for this war—an end of course diabolical, but let us pay due homage to the fact that the means have been adapted, to a mischievous end, it is true; and I must confess, in the face of the military questions of theory, organization and machinery, I have a higher idea of German education to-day than I had seven months ago. We all, I hope, shall realize the potentiality of education. Only we shall use this tremendous educational force to a noble end. (Hear, hear.) And I think where the German publicists, teachers and preachers can do no better task is in allying themselves with the Government, and getting the captains of industry to do their part; while we on our side can do no better than to make our resurrected little country a great centre of British influence, to make Great Britain as powerful in moral and political affairs as she will be in economic affairs. Because I am convinced this war has proved to the satisfaction even of the most skeptical that after all it is Great Britain and the British Empire that stands for the political and moral ideals of the future!"

Here Dr. Sarolea sat down, and his speech was followed by long and enthusiastic applause, while some one called for

"Three cheers for Belgium," which were heartily given. Then he requested permission to add a few words, as follows:

"As I have the great privilege of addressing a meeting composed largely of business men, I would only like to say a word, to make one practical intimation. Business men and professional men are practical men, and they will understand me. I have just told you we are going to have in our international British-American University or school a Canadian section, because I am certain that in the future there will be a very close connection between Canada and Belgium. (Hear, hear.) And we hope to have in our institution a Canadian scholarship. We shall want to send every year one or two of our ablest scholars to Canada to study Canadian resources, Canadian life, Canadian opportunities, and to be missionaries for Canada in Belgium. (Hear, hear.) I think the best missionaries for Canada on the continent in the future will be Belgian scholars who will have made on the spot a study of the infinite opportunities and resources of your great Dominion. So I merely intimate that fact, and in case any in the audience may fortunately be interested in the scheme, and inclined to assist in this patriotic enterprise, we should feel very grateful for any support which we might get from Toronto." (Applause.)

(March 22, 1915.)

Traits of the Russian People

By HON. MR. GUILD.*

AT a regular meeting of the Club, held on the 22nd March, Hon. Mr. Guild said:

Mr. President, and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club,—I have had, as Governor of Massachusetts, the responsibility of founding a system of preventive medicine to protect the people of Massachusetts from disease germs, and have viewed the problem of health from that point of view, but to-day I have had the opportunity just now of knowing how small a germ feels when subjected to the public magnifying glass. (Laughter.)

I thank you very much, sir, for your kind and too flattering introduction, and I thank you, gentlemen, for your very kind reception. I feel very much as if I were bringing owls to Athens or coals to Newcastle,—what can I bring about Russia into the city which is the home of Professor Mavor, the founder of the study of the whole subject? (Applause.)

I shall do something like what the Tammany Judge did (laughter) when for the first time tackling English literature—I don't know whether you remember how the Police Judge the morning after the election arrived in the court room, a little the worse for wear (laughter), and the roundsman brought in a *type*—you know the kind, with Kossuth hat, pointed, a rather soiled coat, that looked as if it had been slept in, decidedly soiled linen,—and the Judge asked the roundsman, "Casey, what have you there?" "Habitual drunk and disorderly, Your Honor. I can do nothing with him. He calls himself an *artist*. He is always rolling over the petunia beds in the park, sleeping on the park seats, bothering the nursemaids—I can do nothing with him." "Thirty days for yours!"—this from the Judge. Then said the Thespian: "And has it come to this in my maturer years, incarcerated in the dungeon! And yet I am not born more degenerate

* Hon. Curtis Guild has had a most unique career as a journalist, soldier and public servant. He was Governor of Massachusetts 1906-09, and United States Ambassador to Russia 1911-1913. He also holds the rank of Inspector-General in the American Army, and saw active service in Cuba.

than Dean Swift, not more dissolute than Edgar Allan Poe, not more drunk than Lord Byron!" "Take him away Casey," said the Judge. "That's enough: thirty days for yours! We have no more use for him, the election's over!" (Laughter.) "And one thing more, Casey: if you run across any of them bum friends of his he has been talking about, run them in too!" (Laughter.)

If the reports are true that have just been handed to us from the newspaper offices, the events of this morning or of last night, then it bids fair to be long remembered in the history of this terrible war. The capture of Memel by the Russians was a memorable event, but to-day, this morning, as yet unprinted, comes the astounding news for the world that within twenty-four hours Przemysl—Przemysl, get that pronunciation (laughter, and "Thank you," from Hon. Wallace Nesbitt)—Przemysl, in Galicia, which has held out so gallantly so many months, has finally surrendered to the Russian forces (cheers) leaving the way open to all Silesia to the Russian army; and that at the same time Italy has joined the Allies! (Cheering loud and long, and a wild demonstration.) If there should be any mistake in that (laughter) do not charge it to the American who wishes you well, but to the efficiency of the Canadian press reports. (Laughter.)

Seriously speaking, it seems to me that the time has come that all fair-minded men all over the world should begin at least to disregard the slanderous reports which for nearly half a century have filled the American press in regard to the great Empire which is your ally, and which is our historic friend, the Empire of Russia. (Applause.) The time has come that the evil veil spun across the visage of the Slav by venomous insects should be stripped away, and that the truth should be told at last, and not merely Russia but the whole Slav race shown to the world, not as spoiled by their enemies, but as truthfully depicted by their friends. (Applause.) For fair play and justice alike demand from every honest man all over the world that something at least should be told in honor to destroy these mean insinuations and untruthful reports which in these days of the steady advance of the Allies are the last weapons of cowardly hatred, that Russia should seek to create ill feeling between England and another great nation, which is standing by her, and in spite of all slanderous reports will stand by the Allies to the very bitter end! (Applause.)

It is time, too, that civilized men all over the world should cease to regard these vicious newspaper articles, published in that section of the press that cares more for sensation than it

does for truth, and should at least come to recognize what, not Russia alone, but what the whole Slav race have done for civilization; that after Byzantium had fallen and dropped the protecting sword and shield in the East, the Slav race took it up, and for century after century have stood as the guardian battle line of Europe, that civilization in Europe should be not formed after Asiatic nations, but after the ideas of the Aryan race and the ideals of Christianity. (Applause.)

The insinuations to which I refer can easily be traced back, not to the men who bravely and with the edge of the sword are openly fighting against the Allies in the field, but to the revolutionary and anarchistic elements which are the enemies of any population, who fight with dynamite and bombs and pistols. The anarchist is the common enemy of all the world wherever he may be found. And it is to these organizations that the misrepresentations can easily be traced. One of the most persistent of these rumors is that a secret peace was about to be negotiated between Russia and Germany. The fall of Przemyśl to-day is the answer to that, and has been officially confirmed. (Applause.) And if any further proof were needed, look at the condition in the Dardanelles. Russia will fight through this war to the end. The public statements of Sir Edward Grey and the statements of Russia's great Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Sazonow, agree in every particular. If further proof were needed of any of these statements, take that picture the other day: Russia's available ships in that part of the world are few, and not particularly strong, yet the solitary ship she had in the Dardanelles was by universal consent put in the place of honor at the head of the British and French dreadnoughts, and the fleets of these great nations, headed by this one little Russian ship, sailed forward together, with the weakest fleet in front in the place of honor! (Applause.)

Never before has the Slav race been so united. One of the most remarkable results—a good result from an evil cause—a brotherhood founded on account of the war—has been the united rising up of all the Slav races under the leadership of the most powerful of the Slav races. I chanced to pick up a New York Times of March the 21st, just before I left for this meeting: you will find there on one of the inside pages a most remarkable picture, something that never could have taken place even two years ago: these young men are violating neutrality and the law of nations on account of their love of their race! This is a picture in Russian Poland, of whom? Russians? No. Poles? No. Of naturalized Poles from the

United States National Guard, who have gone back to Poland to fight for the Russians and the Allies! (Applause.)

The story of the "Slav peril" is perhaps one of the most ridiculous inventions of the common enemies, not merely of the Allies, but of civilization. The Slav peril! It is impossible of course for me to go back even to the days of Catherine the Great. She was the sovereign who abolished capital punishment from Russia. Some people suppose that people are whipped to death there with knouts; but there is no capital punishment since the days of Catherine II. But I will take up some things to show you what kind of people the Russians are.

Supposing I tell you about the profession of the ballet. Russia is the only country in the world where the ballet is not a despised calling, but an honored art. The reason that can be so is because the only appointment to the School of Dancing, which is supported entirely by the Emperor, is a matter of competition, and is regarded as an honor. The attendants are carefully supervised by capable matrons, who are educated thoroughly as to their heads as well as their feet. They are supported entirely, even while in the school, out of the endowment fund, and they have no need to look to any other source of support than to the salary paid them, which is larger than the payment of any woman's occupation anywhere else; and they have their choice as to the making of their character, they are not forced into temptation and evil lives. And when they retire—of course they are not all angels—but most of them retire, when about thirty, to become happy wives and mothers. What a vision we could have if some such Slav supervision were possible of the theatres in the United States and Canada! (Hear, hear.)

The same thing is true of the drama. It is subsidized by the Emperor, not by the Government out of taxation drawn from the people, but this is done by the Emperor out of his own income. I have seen performances of Shakespearean drama in Petrograd such as was never seen in the Lyceum, even in the days of Sir Henry Irving. In detail, the arms, the army, the *mise en scène*, everything was perfectly carried out, the same as in the French classic drama. The Tsar, when a drama using Romanoff soldiers was to be produced a couple of years ago, was so anxious to have everything absolutely right, that he even had pieces taken from the Museum representing their equipment. The stage is taken seriously as a matter of education and an honorable profession. Wherever you find modern literature, modern writers, modern music,

such names as Russia is presenting now to-day, both in literature and music, are as an uplift in every art in the countries of the entire world.

In mere material progress, for example, the increase in railroads gives a pretty good idea. You know the railroad is generally the pioneer in a country—the clergyman and the school teacher arrive on the railroad! (Laughter.) Furthermore, national defence is immensely promoted, as we have recently seen, by the building of railroads, enabling the transportation of troops. In 1884, the Russian railroad trackage was 21,000 miles altogether; to-day it is 45,000 miles! This present Emperor, so much abused in those sensational despatches, has built more railroads than the total built by all his predecessors put together! The railroad builder is no foe to civilization! (Hear, hear.)

Again, we all believe,—your race and mine, at any rate,—in "*mens sana in corpore sano*"; we believe in the open air life and in athletics. Until recent years, there was no great national sport, except skating, no wholesome outdoor game, such as football, baseball, rowing, or track athletics. But now you see rowing, tennis courts,—no baseball,—but football, and track athletics, all over the Empire. The Boy Scout movement in Russia to-day is not, as in some places, an encouragement, shall we say? to militarism; the Russian Boy Scouts are not trained particularly in the art of war; but, at least till recently, their training was something like that of a Turn Verein, with dumbbells, Indian clubs, horizontal bar, drill with wands, and other exercises that tend to develop the muscles. In 1912 I had the privilege of seeing the men who were sent to Stockholm to take part in the Olympic Games, the first national attempt of Russia to participate in such a contest. They did not win much in the way of victories; they stood rather low on the list. But you remember the story Boswell tells of Dr. Johnson, after seeing a performance by some dancing dogs; the Doctor said, "Of course, the dogs did not dance well; but the miracle was they could dance at all!" In a similar way, the fact that a country which less than a dozen years ago did nothing at all in athletics, could go into the Olympic Games and do as well as it did, is a marvel. Finally, I am further told, athletic instruction is being given in the schools of Russia. An Emperor who will take the children, the boys and girls, out of the close, stuffy houses of his Empire, and put them into the open fields, to fill their lungs with good fresh air, to give them vigorous bodies and put them into a healthy state of living, which would be followed, of

course, by a healthy state of thinking, an Emperor who will insist on the preservation of the bodies as well as the minds of the children of his people, cannot be said to be a "peril" to the civilization of the world! (Applause.)

Education—I wish I might dwell upon this at length. There is very much yet to be done. Russia, with the exception of Portugal, has the largest percentage of illiterates to-day. I am going to tell you why there are so many illiterates. Russia has very crowded centres of population, and vast unpeopled or thinly peopled wastes. You can have universal education in the large centres, and it is rapidly approaching that in the large cities of Russia; but the difficulty is very much the same as you experience in the remoter parts of your Dominion. How easy it is to criticize, and say "What a large percentage of illiterates!" But how are you going to organize school districts, when the individual houses are twenty miles apart, with no railroads and no good highways? The actual physical difficulties are largely responsible for the illiteracy.

I am not going to enlarge upon the Duma. The fact is, however, that Russia for the first time has at least an approach to popular government. We all know that the Emperor showed no anxiety for it himself; but he yielded to the demand. And if I were allowed to "tell the secrets of my prison house" as a diplomat, you would find that the Duma is something distinctly to be reckoned with when one is trying to make a treaty. The Duma is real, no shadowy thing. That is a big step of progress.

Finally we have this most remarkable act, which would be possible only in a country with a Government like the Russians', in the suppression of the great national evil of the vodka traffic. (Applause.) Vodka is a little less strong, has a little less alcohol, than whisky; and, as you know, it is distilled from the cheapest of all materials, potatoes. It is not drunk from a glass, but from the bottle, a pint at a time. There is no gentle approach to a horizontal position, but it is taken instantly and like a blow! The danger, the menace, the more than menace—the injury—to industry and especially to the service in the army, from that one recognized national vice, must be seen to be understood. It took no pressure from anybody to accomplish that effect; it took only the earnest pleading of one man, an apostle of temperance, who showed the present ruler of Russia the results as they were. Not listening to the temptation that this was a Government monopoly, that Russia was at war, and that the country needed

the revenue—as you know, the revenue from the vodka traffic was eight hundred million rubles a year—for that reason the Prime Minister, who was also the Minister of Finance, resigned; for that reason the Emperor was obliged to reorganize his Imperial Council. This man, who, we are told, lacks initiative, and is ruled by ———, needed no convincing, reorganized his Imperial Council, dismissed his Prime Minister, and took away the temptation of the alcohol devil from his soldiers and his workmen in time of war! (Hear, hear, and applause.)

“Slav peril!” (Laughter.) There is one once prominent and rich country, now divided under three Emperors, the former Kingdom of Poland. They don’t now—at least this is what they have said to me—desire independence; they prefer, so far as foreign relations are concerned, to be under some one Crown. Three Emperors of Germany, Austria and Russia,—had the same opportunity of bringing about a way to satisfy the longings of these people. One Emperor of the three, and one Emperor only, took advantage of his opportunity, and through his great General and cousin, the Grand Duke Nicolai, he proclaimed that Poland, not merely Russian Poland, but that all Poland, Russian, Austrian and German, should reap their reward, should get Home Rule for all Poland together, the use of their own language, and the making of their own laws. (Applause.)

I want to tell you one thing more: he has given an earnest that he means what he says. The Russians are perhaps the most devout people that live, the most earnest believers in their own Church, the Orthodox Russian Church. Poland, as you know, is not of that faith, but of the Roman Catholic, probably more intensely so than any other nation, unless we except the people of Ireland. The Russian Emperor has gone to see those who live under fire, has gone to Poland to the trenches; more than that, has contributed of his own income for their comfort; and finally, this “narrow-minded bigot” is now rebuilding the churches in Poland, of a faith that has always contended with his, the churches destroyed by the invader! (Applause.)

It is not sensational newspaper writers that vouch for the wonderful loyalty of the Russian people to their Emperor. If it were told of by newspaper geniuses, it might be said that these are exceptional instances and not the real and common feelings of the people. It is sober-minded Boston merchants,—friends of mine,—who actually saw the declaration of war given by the Emperor in the midst of his people. Did

he lock himself up in the Winter Palace? Oh, no! The intention of the good Emperor was to explain *coram populo*—in the midst of his people—why the war had to come. The immense Square, before the Winter Palace, was occupied hours before the announced time by a throng of many thousands of Russians, these Bostonian business men among them. The Emperor came out in front of the Winter Palace. The scene in the court was one that one would scarcely see in any other country in the world. Instead of cheering, shouting, or making any noise, these eighty thousand Russians dropped to their knees in prayer for the success of their Emperor, spontaneously, and never rose until the signal was given by the Emperor himself! Then the cheering broke forth, round after round, and could not be stopped until the Emperor gave the signal to be silent; whereupon he read a statement, explaining in simple words to his people, why the war could not be avoided; why he and they together must work to uplift the race and for the victory of the nation. At the close the same tremendous cheering was doubled and redoubled. The Emperor stepped back, and brought forth his wife and family of children. The people cheered and cheered until the Emperor went back with his children into the Winter Palace. A scene of affectionate devotion like that and undivided loyalty does not seem to indicate any splitting up of the Slav people, or any lack of loyalty at the time of this crisis, where the line is drawn not merely between nations but between races, and where the Russians certainly have patriotism towards their Emperor, and are inspired with loyalty, devotion, affection, courage and sacrifice. (Applause.)

May I tell you another incident? It has reference to the Titanic disaster. Did you hear what the Russian Emperor ordered after that terrible calamity? It was entirely suppressed in the newspapers of the United States; perhaps you here were more fortunate in getting an account of it. Alone amongst the great rulers of the world the Emperor of Russia, not content with sending the usual message of condolence and sympathy, ordered a grand high mass to be pronounced at Petrograd for the repose of the souls, without regard to race or religion, who had gone down into the depths on that terrible day. The other patrons, if I may use that word, of this great religious ceremony, were the Russian Minister of the Navy, and the officers of every single line of merchant vessels that carried the Russian flag. There were among the diplomatic corps just two groups of guests, your devoted, able and popular representative, the British Ambassador, Sir George

Buchanan, and suite, and a much less important personage, the American Ambassador, with his. (Laughter and applause.) The Archpriest of Petrograd pronounced the ceremony. The Archpriest is in the Greek Church what the Archbishop is in Western Churches, the same in rank. The choir was made up, in that city of wonderful choirs and church music, of selections from the best choirs in Petrograd. The scene was what, to my thinking, in that city of beautiful churches such as the Cathedral of Kazan, the most beautiful church, the Cathedral of the Admiralty. We arrived there, and with difficulty Sir George and I made our way up into the beautiful great body of the church. The ceremony was most beautiful and most impressive, and in a short but touching address that was made by the Archpriest he proclaimed that although, glory be to God—"Slav Tagod"—no Russian subject had met his death in that terrible disaster, men could not think of any awful event such as that along lines of national loss, but recognize it as a terrible catastrophe in which not only the nations immediately interested but all humanity should mourn together. And in touching words he added that though the cloud was intensely black, its lining was more than silver, of the most pure and refined gold, for in the midst of all this terrible loss of life was the thought, not of suffering, but that that great crowd of men and women, in their hour of death, did not turn to desperation, panic or drunkenness, they turned to the religion of their fathers, and met their death smiling, and intoning a hymn of the Christian faith, they went down into the depths, "to meet their Captain face to face." (Applause.)

More touching even than this ceremony was the spectacle outside the church. These poor people, mujiks, unlettered for the most part, knew they could not get inside the church, but their Emperor had called them to mourn for a great suffering of mankind, and the whole of that square, every alleyway and street leading to that square, was actually jammed with people, simple Russian peasants, standing there on that cold spring day, every head uncovered, until the tolling of the passing bell stopped, and they knew the ceremony was over. Not theirs to participate in the brilliant and beautiful service in the church, but for them to show the respect and sorrow in the only way they could, in sympathy for other nations, with bowed foreheads and uncovered heads. The Emperor who can give such an order, and the common mob in the streets that can show such sympathy for suffering,—is there any "Slav peril" in a race like that? (Applause.)

It is not a mere political orator, it is not a sensational newspaper writer, it is a Russian scholar, a Russian scholar of Liberal opinions, it is Paul Vinogradoff,—I wish you could all read his little brochure from which I read this sentence. He was formerly Professor of History in the University of Moscow, now Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence in the University of Oxford. He says of Russia's solidarity, leadership and loyalty: "I may add that whatever may have been the shortcomings and the blunders of the Russian Government, it is a blessing in this decisive crisis that Russians should have a firmly-knit organization and a traditional centre of authority in the power of the Tsar. The present Emperor stands as the national leader, not in the histrionic attitude of a War Lord, but in the quiet dignity of his office. He has said and done the right thing, and his subjects will follow him to a man. We are sure he will remember in the hour of victory the unstinted devotion and sacrifices of all the nationalities and parties of his vast Empire." That is the statement of a Russian Liberal, living abroad, because until now of the unfortunate conditions in which he found himself on account of his radical notions; that is his verdict on the present situation in Russia to-day!

It happens to be my happy privilege to be President of the New England Committee for Polish Relief, as I am also of Russian Relief,—and that one American should hold both positions without objection from either side, is perhaps a pretty good indication of the way these Slav peoples are living to-day. It has been my good fortune to read letters from Polish soldiers fighting in different regiments, all speaking as Vinogradoff of how the Slav race is standing together, and of the Russians' perfect trust in their Emperor. There are pathetic details, and some stories of cases of suffering and especially the women, generally cultured women, are suffering in the Austrian war zone. You hear a great deal about the suffering in the western zone, but the story of the east is yet to be written! One of these letters I think I can repeat to you almost word for word. The writer is a sister of a very prominent Polish musician,—with the possible exception of Paderewski, the most prominent Polish musician, who has visited the New England States. She is there in Warsaw and wrote this letter to her brother, who showed it and translated it to me.—Five years ago this man's attitude was most hostile to Russia!—She writes: "My dear brother: and so forth—personal matters,—It is now late at night. This day is the most wonderful ever known in the entire history of Warsaw.

Could you ever imagine I should have spent the entire day weeping on the necks of our Russian sisters, and sobbing with happy tears? For three mornings I had nothing to eat but rye meal and some potatoes. This morning there came to Warsaw train after train, forty cars in all, laden with clothes, food, medicines, money, everything we need. The Emperor himself sent 200,000 rubles." (By the way, he has recently sent two million more.) "Everything, in short, we have need of came, as I say, in forty freight cars, and all the gifts of Russians, all the result of collections taken in one city, Petrograd. It is the Russians that have come to the relief of us suffering Poles! For, best of all, they did not send their gifts, they brought them themselves, and came with them! (Applause.) There has been speechmaking, and there has been singing, and there have been such scenes of tumultuous delight as one could never have imagined even five years ago. It is not the nation of Russia that is rising up for the just cause, it is the whole Slav race that is working together as a unity for the ideals of the Slav!" (Applause.) That is a letter from a Polish woman of high cultivation and of education!

Now, let me give you another aspect of Russia, one very seldom touched upon, her methods of handling colonies and new civilizations. Very few things show the weaknesses of a nation more quickly than its treatment of colonies. I am not going to enlarge upon Porto Rico and the Philippines, in which a certain very proud Republic is not altogether free from mistakes. (Laughter.) Have you ever heard the story of Russian Turkestan, where the victories of Skobelev in 1881 were followed by problems as to the handling of the newly acquired districts. This whole district was inhabited till then by nomadic tribes of Turcomans—savages, living largely on mutton, sleeping in black felt tents. Nothing was your own that you could not defend with your own sword and your own flintlock musket. Fortunately that territory was conquered. Then comes in the Russian Government. It was perfectly arid, like our sage brush desert in the West. They took the "chief chief," if I may use the expression, of these Tartar robbers, one Ali Khan, brought him to Moscow, and to Petrograd, showed him the comforts of modern civilization, introduced him to something absolutely new, a Russian bath—(A voice—"Poor fellow!" and laughter)—yes, a Russian bath is a national delight and luxury, I don't know any other nation so fond of the bath, even though it may come only on Saturday night,—and they may put on their dirty

clothes again.—They introduced him to food distinctly better than raw mutton, and to beverages—well, pleasanter than muddy coffee and more palatable than water; and to clean clothes. And after they had been to the Petrograd music houses, and he had seen how absolutely preferable was this living among civilized persons than among his little tribes of spearmen who had nothing but their guns, they turned to him and said: “Ali Khan, you have been a robber, and so have all your people; but you are splendid fighting men; and we know you have the reputation that you have never broken your word. We propose to make your people happy and prosperous. You can have these clean clothes and all these other good things. Wouldn’t you rather live in this way than under a black felt tent in the desert? We shall not interfere with your religion; we don’t send out missionaries to stir up trouble; the faith of your fathers shall be entirely undisturbed. But you must go into the country, introduce law and order, plant cotton, and make this an agricultural district. You must organize your tribe, not as robbers, but as policemen. You have martial law to protect the farmers and the business arising out of that occupation. If you want any fighting, you can have it, not as robbers and murderers, but in time of war fighting in our armies honorably for the success of Russia. What will you do? Go back and be respected as the Russian Governor of Turkestan, and introduce law and order, without interference with your religion or the faith of your fathers?” Of course he accepted the job. He went back to Turkestan, changing his name from Ali Khan to Alikhanoff. His methods respecting law and order at first were necessarily—shall we say?—a little brusque; (laughter) but there are occasions when that has to be done. If you had been chased by bandits and knew what they were going to do to you, you would feel the need of being brusque in dealing with them. I have had that happy experience! Now, Russian Turkestan is beginning to blossom like the rose. Formerly it did not grow any cotton; now Russia raises there one half of her needs in cotton. It is a damage to the prosperity of the cotton planters of the United States, but if any credit is due to the man who makes two blades of grass to grow where one grew before, what shall we say is due of credit to the Government of an Empire that will make an absolutely arid desert, without any blades of grass at all, one of the most prosperous agricultural regions of the world? (Applause.)

Now, if you will pardon a suggestion about your own Government in the British Empire, never, in my humble opinion, did it do a wiser act than when it changed its historic attitude towards Russia, through Sir Arthur Nicolson, the predecessor as Ambassador of Sir George Buchanan at Petrograd, and instead of fighting with another great European nation, joined hands with the other great European nation and the great Christian nation, in Asia, for the progress of the principles, and first of all, for the civilization and better government of all parts of Asia which those two great powers control.

I must not talk to you too long, I am afraid I have exceeded my time, but I want, if I may say just one word more, to mention a perfectly simple thing,—it seems very strange and unnecessary to us,—I refer to the vast expanse of territory of the Russian Empire. I have referred to your schools, and how your farmers find it hard to organize school districts. When I went to Russia, some friends asked us were we going to take our motor car. No, we said, the roads were very bad, and we would get horses. They replied: "Why it would be very comfortable to take a little trip for dinner or luncheon from St. Petersburg down to Moscow. (Laughter.) You couldn't do it unless you had a motor car." Those places look very near together on the map, for Russia is on a small scale and Switzerland is on a very large scale. But from Moscow to Petrograd is rather longer a distance than from Montreal to Boston. It would be rather difficult to run down the same day! Yet those two great centres of population are about as near together as any Russian cities of size. It takes twelve hours by special express train,—one starts at 10 o'clock in the morning and arrives at 10 o'clock at night, the other leaves at 10 o'clock at night and arrives at 10 o'clock in the morning. The historic story is told of an Emperor of Russia, who when a railroad was to be built, was in his library looking at the plan; he threw it aside, and taking a ruler laid it on the map and drew a line across, saying, "Build it along that line! I want access from Petersburg to Moscow as quickly as possible." (Laughter.) "But, Your Imperial Majesty," objected the engineer, "there are a great many towns that will stand off the line if it is built that way." "Let them move up the towns!" That was old Russia, ten to fifteen years ago.

It is a country of tremendous distances. There is altogether a population of 171 millions, according to the last census, quite a tidy little population! The district is so vast that except in the large cities it is very thinly peopled. How

thinly, you may gather from this fact: I have on the floor of my library the skin of a Russia brown bear, shot forty-five miles from the Capital of European Russia. Suppose that one could run from Boston to Worcester, or from New York up to Poughkeepsie and shoot lynx, bears, wolves and buffalo! One goes a long distance, even along the railroad running from Berlin across the frontier to Petrograd, through vast expanses which are merely swamp and forest, without seeing any human habitation unless an occasional one of a switch tender. It is not easy to mobilize troops or to establish schools in a country like that. You wonder why they wear those heavy, clumsy boots,—less clumsy than the German boots, however,—reaching to the knees; if you lived where there was mud or snow most of the year, you would have to wear boots like those; they are the only kind you could get, except the birch-bound boots.

They lost 100,000 men in the Japanese War, in 42 days; but they were only able to bring out of European Russia 21,000 men to replace the 100,000 lost; that was by the great Trans-Siberian Railroad. It has only a single track, and that is broken in the centre by Lake Baikal, about as large as Lake Superior. You would think here that it would be a long distance to transport troops from Eastport, Maine, to a battle line at Seattle. Yet the distance would be about the same as from Petrograd to Vladivostock, and it would take the same number of days to travel, and then you would have two days farther to travel after that out into the middle of the Pacific Ocean.

One thing more: it was not Russia that asked the United States to interfere, it was the Empire of Japan that requested interference and an end of the war! Peace followed. I have that on the best authority—from the man on this side who received the letter!

Although the Russian troops fought against overwhelming odds, Russia did not consider their performances satisfactory. From the very day of the Treaty of Portsmouth, the Russian army was reorganized. You have seen what has been done: not merely is there a battle line stretching almost without break from the Balkans to the Persian Gulf, on which the enemies of Russia say there are four million men, but higher estimates say seven millions—at least we can be content with saying there is an army big enough to do the job! (Applause.) Their first step was to remove the older officers, who no longer had the inspiration and the spring of youth; and together with others, it always happens to every country when

the actual test of war comes, there were those who were very good on paper, but of no use in actual battle. More than twenty per cent. were retired or discharged, and the rest were made to go with their men. The practice of "*Coburging*"—in the United States that term is used to describe the actions of an officer who is always looking for separate assignments, to be a military *attaché* to some court, anywhere instead of with his men on duty—that kind of thing was universally frowned upon and stopped. The officers were made to live with their own troops, to teach them generally, not military matters alone; but to give them education and ideals. The result is seen in the reconstruction of the nation's War Department. A Military Investigating Committee was sent through Europe to see the different troops of the different nations. They reported, and at least the cavalry arm especially has been improved,—I do not speak of the Cossacks, anybody tells you about them,—but the regulars, the Hussars and Dragoons,—in the cavalry arm really the men of Russia lead the world. They are men who can fight on foot just as valiantly as the English Second Dragoon Guards, better known as the Scots Greys, in Blenheim. Shoulder to shoulder, in that obsolete position known as "Support arms," with the long rifles held in their left arms, officers leading, drums beating, colors flying, with bayonets on their guns,—that was the old cavalry regiment of the British army. Similar feats are being performed to-day; the Russians have taken up the new ideas, and all the old notions are discarded. With bayonet on their carbines, when dismounted they can act, not as skirmishers, but as a line of infantry, deliver a bayonet charge, and fire their repeating rifles. This whole revision of the army organization and practice has taken place within recent years.

I am constantly asked why the name of the Capital was changed from St. Petersburg to Petrograd. Particularly because of the Slav feeling uprising. Petersburg is a German name, Petrograd means the same, "Peter's City," only it is a Slav word instead of a German word. The city was founded by Peter the Great,—St. Peter had nothing whatever to do with it. (laughter) it is only your nation and mine that ever made that mistake! "Grad" or "Gorod" are two Slav forms meaning "city" or "town": "Novgorod" sounds formidable, but "Newtown" or "Newton" is simple; "Nijni Novgorod," where the bazaar is held, is "Newton Lower Down," "The New City down the River"; "Belgrade" means "White City" in the same way, and so I might go on.

Recently you may have noticed that the Russians are getting back territory formerly held by Slavs. A large part of Eastern Europe was held principally by Slav races, if we include the Venns, as far west as Berlin. Berlin was built on Slav territory, and there are suburbs of the city to-day inhabited by Slav people. And villages are still there in all that part of Germany, as for example in Limberg, or Loewenberg,—they have given that a Slav name, exactly as the city of Lyons, in France, because built where there was more or less fighting all through the Middle Ages. And if now in the battles in Silesia Russia should take the Capital, it is likely there would be a change of name. Breslau, again, is a corruption from the Slavonic name, originally Bratislau, to mean "Brother Slav"—*not* "slave," that offensive meaning was put upon it by their enemies. "Slav" means "glorious race," consequently with its increasing success; we shall probably see more and more changing of geographical names, and the restoration of Slav names formerly prevalent there.

You have been very patient. I thank you very much for this opportunity of coming before you and speaking of that country "who was my friend, faithful and just to me." A kinder people to the foreigner could never be met than the Slav race, and especially the Russian branch of the Slav race; gentle in their habits, kind to strangers, devoted as friends, lavish as hosts, that is what I found the Russian people. And when you think of some few of the things I have been able to tell you, never again use the Bear, the emblem of barbarism, as the emblem of that great race! Not the Bear, but the double-headed golden Eagle, is the emblem of Russia, taken by Ivan the Great, taken through the right of his Sofian consort, and carried ever since the fall of Byzantium as the emblem of civilization, the Roman Eagle, East and West, the historic emblem of that great Empire of Rome, which stood against the barbarians of the north in the Dark Ages. Not the Bear, but the golden Eagle, of civilized rule to-day, East and West, shines to-day on the flag of the Russian people and Emperor, as an inspiration to even greater civilization!" (Applause.)

(April 15, 1915.)

The War and the Bible

BY PROFESSOR JOHN MACNAUGHTON.*

AT a special meeting of the Canadian Club of Toronto, held on the 15th of April, Professor Macnaughton said: *Gentlemen*,—I have just returned from a tour through part of the Northwest. My business there was to address the Easter Conference of the teachers of Saskatchewan, held at Yorkton. I was privileged in addition to visit the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon. Thus I had a good opportunity of seeing something with my own eyes of the educational system of that great province. I was very much impressed, indeed, by what I saw; I do not think there is any other part of Canada where the teachers take their work so seriously as they do there. They know and everybody else knows that their work is going to count enormously in the building up of a mighty future, and they magnify their office in proportion. The women teachers seemed to me especially notable. One I found engaged in teaching domestic science with a conviction and enthusiasm worthy of St. Paul. When we remember what a mixed confluence of races from the less well ventilated parts of Europe have gathered on our prairies, each bringing his own distinct national type of bacillus with him, we shall be able to appreciate what she is likely to contribute by preaching the gospel of fresh air, cleanliness and good cooking—the basis of all civilization, indispensable everywhere, and above all in Saskatchewan where in a short time the people are to be allowed nothing to drink to eke out the sustaining quality of the rather poor stuff they, for the most part, eat. Another lady I found no less enthusiastic in the equally important matter of circulating libraries. It is not possible for us to conceive what the hunger for books can be in those vast monotonous spaces. There was another truly astonishing phenomenon which quite took my breath away—it was indeed a portent and a prodigy. I found that the Prime Minister of Saskatchewan had chosen for himself

*Professor John Macnaughton, after a distinguished career at Aberdeen and Cambridge Universities, came to McGill University as Head of the Department of Classics in 1900. He is widely known as a contributor to literary periodicals.

—what Portfolio do you think? The very last you would imagine, the one which everywhere else is the Cinderella among the departments of state—the portfolio of Education. Mr. Scott, whose politics I did not enquire about—I have no politics myself except that I am always “agin the Government” and believe most firmly that any political party whatever in Canada after five or six years of office is invariably in urgent need of being taken out into the chill air of virtuous opposition and hung up to dry there—Mr. Scott is convinced that the all-important thing for the development of Saskatchewan is Education. He is keenly and intelligently interested in it, this rare bird among Canadian Premiers. It was indeed a delight to come across such an experience for one whose long connection with Education had made him unfortunately familiar with a very different condition of things in Canada, where it may be said to be the rule that the men who control and direct our educational affairs are often of the type which it is the very *raison d’être* and chief end of any decent educational system to extirpate and abolish from off the face of the earth.

With the University of Saskatchewan I was particularly delighted. Here, too, was something refreshingly new, something which points to a better time than ours. Within a minute’s walk of the buildings consecrated to the old subjects, Classics, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Philosophy, Theology and Plumbing—I mean of course Applied Science,—beautiful buildings with residences for the students erected on the principle of scorn for the cheap and nasty, are the stables of the Agricultural Faculty full of magnificent cattle, fine specimens of bulls, horses and rams. What a place to read the *Georgics* of Virgil in! One could apply the practical method of the immortal Squeers—“Spell winder—go and clean it”—to illustrate that splendid old poet and farmer. And one point more, if I may be excused for dwelling at such disproportionate length on what I found so fascinating and so full of promise: what an admirable arrangement that the men of light and leading in Saskatchewan, the future clergymen, doctors, lawyers and teachers, should be trained as here side by side with the men who are to be the backbone of the country, the young farmers! The so-called learned, by profession will go away from college with a proper respect for the fundamental industry of Canada and for those engaged in it, with whom in Saskatoon they often room together. They will be aware that farming needs, if not more brains, at least as much brains as any other profession, including the church

itself. The University, instead of fixing a gulf between the various ranks and conditions of men, will be a great bond of intelligent sympathy and solidarity in this happy province.

But while contemplating all these signs of good hope with the liveliest pleasure, I was all the time obsessed as it were by one insistent thought which would not down. All this enthusiasm for education is most admirable, I reflected. The rank of any modern people in the scale of civilization is going to depend more and more upon the extent to which they bring the results of exact science to bear upon their industry. Nay, the test of a people's manhood is to a very large extent the capacity they show for living on the heights of our time in that matter, in their capacity for creating power. But of all nations which is the one that has taken the lead in this regard? Who have shown for the last hundred years the greatest respect for exact knowledge, and the greatest patience and thoroughness in acquiring and utilizing it? Why of course the Germans. See what they have done in agriculture, for instance, Take their solution of the apparently desperate problem of competing successfully against our sugar-cane with their immensely less promising beets. First by their chemical research they invented a beautiful process for making the most of the beet, extracting the last grain of sugar out of it. Then, tackling the difficulty from the other side, by the most thorough-going and methodical procedure, carefully testing the temperature and degree of moisture in the soil by instruments of scientific precision, and increasing the depth of the humus by cautious and gradual working in of the cold unfruitful subsoil, they produced a beet with far more sugar in it to extract. They are the only people in the world who have added to their territory *in the third dimension*. And that is but one example of what they have done in almost every sphere. Think, for instance, of what aerial navigation owes to them. And that again is nothing to their exploitation of the air and its limitless store of nitrogen by the discovery and application of the principles involved in the nitrification of the soil by means of leguminous plants. A formidable people indeed! And yet to my mind the most formidable thing about them lies in a region as far as possible removed from such and similar achievements. Here it is. Within the past hundred years—little as in this case they seem to have applied their knowledge—they have done more than all the rest of the world put together for the elucidation of the Bible, both Old and New Testaments. That was above all what made me shake in my shoes as it became plainer and plainer that they were destined

to come into collision with us. Well, the collision has come. And it has come in such a way as to show to absolute demonstration that the utmost efficiency in accumulating and exploiting mere knowledge is not enough. It is not knowledge but righteousness which exalteth a nation. All their culture has not saved this great people from making the most colossal exhibition of insolence, folly and fatuity which has ever been known in history.

It is not enough to be able to create power! Still more indispensable is it that you should be able to make a decent use of it, to make a humane and wise and modest and loving use of it.

"O, it is excellent
To have a giant's power, but tyrannous
To use it like a giant."

"Tyrannous" and therefore fatuous. "Tyrannous" and therefore suicidal. God rules. "Out of the heart come the issues of life." The highest glory and the proudest achievement of any people is still, as the prophets, and holy men of old saw so clearly, at a time when it was much less easy to see than it is now that God has grown so strong on earth through His own Cross, to enter with full purpose of heart and endeavor into the distinctive work of our modern civilization, the work of fellowship, collaboration and co-operation among the peoples. That is just what the Germans have refused to do. Their point of view is not modern in this all-important respect. It is Assyrian, almost ante-diluvian. It goes back beyond the cruel kings of Nineveh and Babylon to the "dragons" that "tore each other in the slime." If ever any nation held out the right hand of fellowship to another earnestly and ardently desiring co-operation, we did that to Germany! Read what Sir Edward Grey had to say to them even at the eleventh hour, nay at the twelfth, and you will know that this is true. They would not have it! They would not collaborate! They were bound to dominate! We shall see if they do!

Knowledge is a test of manhood, one of the supreme tests but not the supremest of all. We need more than professors. I am almost ashamed of being a professor in these days. It is a disgrace to bear the same name as the three-score long-eared Imperial Privy Councillors who have brayed a benediction on the murderous tusk and claw of the Almighty Whole Hog in Shining Armour who has rooted in the gardens of Belgium! I had rather be a blacksmith or even a plumber than that sort of professor. Professors are very well in their

way so long as they are not what Lord Palmerston called them, damned professors, and so long as they are kept in their proper place, which is an entirely subordinate one. But more is needed than professors. We need, gentlemen, what we have in this Bible here—we need prophets, poets. There are many professors in Germany. They know an enormous deal. Their heads are encyclopædias—*Konversations Lexika* they call them. The Germans know everything, says someone, and understand nothing. The French know nothing—it is a pity they don't, they should know more; so should we, and the Great Schoolmaster will make us learn by his rough method of knocking our heads together with the heads of those who do know—you can't beat a people like that without learning from them—the French know nothing, says this observer, and understand everything. There are many professors in Germany but few prophets. What is a prophet? Well, Jeremiah, who was one himself if ever there was one, partly tells us. He is a man who "can stand like an iron pillar and a wall of bronze," alone against the madness of a whole people and their king. Among that incurably gregarious people, drilled to a goose-step following of the Imperial Bellwether or rather Billy-goat with his persuasive bleat alternating with what he means to be taken for a roar of "frightfulness," it is hard, almost impossible to do that. The very last German who did it was Luther at the Diet of Worms. And what enabled him and the other prophets, his predecessors, to do it? This, that they "could do no other" because the overwhelming majority, they knew, was after all with them, pushing them on from behind—the majority which is made up of God Himself and the ever-growing invisible cloud of witnesses, the myriad legions of angels and of saints—St. George, for instance, who is now busy at his old work upon the dragon, ably seconded as usual by St. Andrew and St. Patrick—the stars in their courses who fought against Sisera, the eternal law and truth graven on the rock-foundations of the Universe. One man and God are always a majority, one man who is quite sure that the Power which rules this world will not rest till "justice runs down in it like rivers and righteousness like a mighty stream." Without the vision of such men the people perish. Without that they have not the words of eternal life. We need the prophets, the poets. We need, it is our deepest need of all, what this Bible stands for. It does not teach us the multiplication table or the parallelogram of forces; it does not help much to produce that steam-drill

kind of mind which can bore into the secrets of nature and tap for our chores the illimitable store-houses of her forces. But what in the last resort do they all amount to? They are but love's bag of tools and mill-dam. It is good and indispensable that we should learn to use them. It is better that we should use them well, for the end that they were meant to serve. If we use them for other ends, however, masterfully and skilfully, we shall perish, our sun shall set and go down in the stinking mud as the mighty German power is doing before our eyes.

In order that we may use them well it is not enough to know. We must be taught to feel. To perceive finely, to feel justly, generously, humanely and kindly. That is of even greater import to us than that we should know. The Bible is still for the great mass of men the best means towards this central and all-controlling right attitude of mind. It is hard to put it into words. Perhaps St. Paul will help. "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, if there be any praise"—to "think of these things." That is what is needed. Or, perhaps, our own finest and purest poet, Wordsworth, has expressed it in a way which will come home with conviction to some of us:—

"Hark, it is the mountain echo,
Solitary, clear, profound,
Answering to the wandering cuckoo,
Giving to her sound for sound.

Unsolicited reply
To a babbling wanderer sent;
Like her ordinary cry,
Like, but O! how different!

Hears not also mortal life,
Hear not we unthinking creatures,
Slaves of folly, love and strife,
Voices of two different natures?

Have not we too—Yes, we have—
Answers from we know not whence,
Echoes from beyond the grave
Recognized intelligence?

Often as thine inward ear
Catches such rebounds, beware!
Listen to them, hold them dear,
For of God, of God they are."

These fine echoes, faint and far to most of us, have been seized and set down for us by the seers and heroes whose music, struck from them by the blows of hard experiences or unlocked sweetly by the joy of life, is stored in this great and sacred Book. It is our deepest concern to listen, and dwell on them, and let them sink into the innermost substance of our souls.

But what we call the Bible is not the whole of the great Bible of mankind. It is indeed only one chapter of that, although the central one, I firmly believe, and the key to all the rest. The entire Bible of mankind is a much more extensive work. It includes the best in all great literature; all that is deep and true and spoken with perfect sincerity and power in the whole recorded range of human utterance, the words of clear insight into the perennial nature of this moving world, the trumpet calls to manhood, every cry of honest love for the good and of honest indignation against cruelty and injustice, and every tuneful echo of the mystery, the oddity, the beauty and the pity of things. One book for instance in this larger Bible would be the book of the prophet Homer. For old Homer was a great prophet, a clear head and a kind heart, a great religious reformer in his day. I will tell you one thing he says which the Germans would do well to take to heart again as in the old days they did indeed, perhaps more than any other European people. "More than the gates of hell I hate the man who says one thing with his lips and hides another in his heart." And here is a word of his for us just now—the deathless word with which Sarpedon urges his comrade to battle: "Friend of my soul, could we by escaping this war then live for ever without old age or death. I should not fight myself among the foremost nor would I send thee into the field of glory. But as it is, death stands over us in ten thousand goblin shapes! So let us on; we shall win a glory for ourselves or give it to another." Mark well: "or give it to another." There is a man three thousand years ago who can fight not only like a hero but like a sportsman and a gentleman! So, I pray God, may England go on fighting, whatever Germany may do!

I should like, too, among many other splendors, to bind up within the boards of this less exclusive Bible I have spoken of, something, nay a good deal, from the Book of the Prophet Sophocles. This for instance, which has a deadly point for our enemies and God's just now, and for us all a weighty and solemn warning: "May it be ours to win a lot of reverent purity sanctioned by those laws of range sublime whose birth is

of the cloudless heaven—High heaven alone their father! Nought mortal hath begotten them nor shall oblivion ever put them to sleep. A mighty God is in them that grows not old.

"Insolence breeds the tyrant. Insolence, when once sated with much prosperity that is not meet nor good for her, scales the topmost pinnacle of pride, and plunges headlong into the abyss of doom, where no swiftness of foot can serve her any more."

Such words and tones, it seems to me, would chime in well with the old Hebraic music, the immortal melodies of Zion. "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord and bow myself down before the high God? Shall I bring him thousands of rams or ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression—the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?

"He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." And high over all, resuming all and touching all with the heavenly light and shadow of their fullest meaning, the gloom and glory, the calm sweetness the terror of the words of him who spake as no man ever spake; higher still "throned in heaven's immortal noon" the banner of his all-inclusive and all-interpreting Cross.

"Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, pray for them that persecute you." "Ye hypocrites, ye generation of vipers, how shall ye escape the damnation of hell?" "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven." "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." "Behold the lilies of the field." "Your heavenly father feedeth them." "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" "Take up your cross and follow me." "He that seeketh his life shall lose it, he that loseth his life shall save it."

There are innumerable passages in this old Hebrew Bible here which I should love to read to you and speak about. It is full of comfort from end to end for those who are ready to fight and die for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake; full of scorn and woe for the shirkers who stand aloof, for the false prophets who cry "Peace: peace!" where there is no peace, and would "heal the hurt" of God's people "slightly." No young man of British blood under thirty in these days, unless he is blind or lame, has any right to call himself a member of a Young Men's Christian Association if he is not prepared to preach the Gospel with a bayonet, the Gospel of Pericles,

of Abraham Lincoln, and, I think, of Jesus, the Good News for all men and for Germans most of all—Government of the people, by the people, for the people. I would specially like to dwell on the song of Deborah (Judges, Chapter V), the very oldest document of Hebrew literature, which has the most astonishingly specific appropriateness to the conditions of the British Empire at this moment. But I have time for only two passages.

In Amos, Chapter V, at the 18th verse you will find something that will amaze you. Amos had to do with a people just like the Germans and our neighbors to the south who hold, in a much more kindly and less truculent way though with hardly less self-complacent certitude, than the Germans themselves, the belief that their country is "God's own country."

Let me say parenthetically that of all people who express themselves on current events I despise most of all those who, like Wells and George Bernard Shaw and I fear to some extent some of our own Canadians, apply themselves to the entirely superfluous business of flattering the Americans. There is no people on earth just now for whose present condition of mind and body butter is so bad as it is for the Americans. And as for that Shavian Ariel, I always knew he was a tin pan, a tinkling brass and a sounding cymbal, a heaven-born mountebank indeed! But with never one full tone in him to respond to the stroke of great things. Better than what he says of his own people in this hour of their life and death struggle I like what that noble American, Henry James, says. There is a man with some blood and bowels, not a desiccated elfin cutting capers in the scorner's chair. Henry James says he has always liked the English, whose hospitality he declares he has shamelessly abused, but never till now did he know how deep was his love and respect for this "decent and dauntless people." That is the truest and finest thing that has ever been said of old England.

But to return to Amos. He had to deal with a people who thought themselves the people of "Gott" and with a king who believed himself to be the son and heir of "Gott." I said the Germans had no prophet just now. I beg pardon. They have a prophet, priest and king, that striped-breeched play-acting prophet on the Spree who has found an immortal formula for his own creed and alas! as yet for his people's. "The German people are the people of Gott. On me as the German Emperor the spirit of Gott has descended. Woe unto unbelievers! Death to cowards and traitors!" In other words, "there is one Gott and little William is his prophet." What wonder

that misfortune has made the Turk his bedfellow!—the Turk whose profession and practice is absolutely identical with his own. It was just such an attitude of mind which confronted Amos. And to crown and cap and clinch the identity, his patients, too, desired and longed for and toasted “the Day.” Here is what Amos has to tell them about it. Here is the douche of his cold-water cure. “Woe unto you that desire the Day! To what end is it for you? The Day is darkness and not light. As if a man did flee from a lion and a bear met him!” Who will not agree, after that, though in a quite opposite sense, with Voltaire, who declared on one occasion that the Minor Prophets (Habakkuk was the one he specified) were capable of everything?

But there is one other passage in the Old Testament, one which practically includes all that is in the New. I should like in closing to bring this one forcibly to your notice. It concerns us nearly. I mean the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. This chapter is one of the high-water marks in the spiritual progress of mankind. It was spoken of a people to begin with. The prophet wishes to unfold to his own people the deepest secret of their destiny; what was the plan of God for them in this world. They were not, he knew, like the Assyrians, Egyptians and Persians, to be great conquerors and rulers. Theirs was a humbler, an immensely more glorious mission. It was to spread the knowledge of the true God. They had come to know him as the Almighty Power which works beneath all the seeming chaos and confusion of history, steadily, surely, irresistibly for the ultimate triumph of righteousness, liberty, kindness, decency, and love. They were to be the missionaries and prophets of that God, and—now comes the wondrous revelation, the deepest truth that ever the mind of man conceived—there was but one way to that, the way of the Cross. The missionaries of the true God must be martyrs. They must suffer for sins not their own. “He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities. The chastisement of our peace was laid upon him and with his stripes we are healed.” Not all Israel would fulfil this destiny, but, the prophet believed, a chosen remnant of Israel would, the heart and kernel of the nation. Gentlemen, it was fulfilled, we know, not by Israel as a whole, and not by any group in Israel. It was fulfilled in our Lord Jesus Christ who trod the winepress all alone. He it was in whom all the promises and prophecies were Yea and Amen. It was He who gathered up into His own work and person the whole meaning and substance of the higher life of Israel according

to the Spirit. But this prophecy, spoken originally of a people, and not fulfilled by that people, has in these days been fulfilled before our eyes in the sufferings of an innocent peaceful people who have been crucified to their own immortal glory and our salvation and the salvation of the world. They might have chosen safety and profit. They chose to follow Jesus. They were "bruised for our iniquities." It is an everlasting shame to us and the silly crew who prevailed so far with us, that when the Bridegroom came like a thief in the night, and the travail pangs of the Kingdom of God, the birth of a new and better time, made all earth shake, we had to stand there gaping like the foolish virgins with no oil in our vessels, while that brave little people—Ah me, for Belgium our sister, our poor little sister who has no breasts now!—were pounded in the mortar of brutal war by those ruthless robbers and damned villains. She was wounded for our transgressions, she was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was laid on her, with her stripes we are healed.

But if that is so, if we cannot acquit ourselves of fault, if we must hang our heads for shame that this should be so, let us make amends so far as amends are possible. Is there a man or woman of that British race which, since the day of the Armada, has ever fought for freedom, that will not join with every other man and woman of that blood in swearing a solemn oath together and keeping it with an equal mind—an oath that even as, to our disgrace and our salvation, this one part of the prophecy has come true, "placarded before our eyes" in Belgium's cross, so also, no less, shall the other part come true, that "she shall see of the travail of her soul and shall be satisfied," that "he who pierced her" shall "look to her" and look up to her?

(April 27, 1915.)

Bismarck's Policies

BY DR. R. A. FALCONER.*

AT a meeting of the Canadian Club held on the 27th April, Dr. R. A. Falconer, President of the University of Toronto, who was the guest and speaker of the day, spoke on "Bismarck's Policies." First he gave expression to what was in the minds and hearts of all with reference to the Canadians' part in the battle of Langemarck, news of which had been coming for a couple of days, with growing lists of casualties. Also at the request of the President of the Club he told something of what the University of Toronto had been doing with regard to the war during the past few months. President Falconer said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I have to thank you for the very kind words of welcome with which you have introduced me to-day, and for the reference that you have made to the work of the University during this winter. Before passing, however, to say anything in the briefest possible way about the University, or my main subject, it would be quite inappropriate not to give expression to the feelings that are in our hearts to-day. (Hear, hear.)

The heart of the Canadian people is to-day moved to its depths as it has never been in our history. We are mourning for those whose deaths have been reported to us; we are sadly expectant of news that may still come to us; and the lull is full of foreboding of what we may have to suffer in the months that lie before us. To-day we Canadians are going through the experience that the Mother Land has been going through in the last nine months. But through this mourning there runs the note of triumph. Though those who have been directly bereaved are smitten into silence, theirs is not the grief of such as refuse to be comforted. The dead, the wounded, and those who, thank God, still live, have suffered gloriously, and have won the gratitude not only of this Dominion but of the Empire and of Western civilization. (Applause.)

*Dr. R. A. Falconer is President of the University of Toronto, and is one of the best known public speakers in the Dominion of Canada.

It means more, Mr. Chairman, to be called a Canadian to-day, than it did a week ago! (Applause.) There is many an unknown man who has been lifted into imperishable fame by reason of his giving all that he had to give for our country and for our Empire. We speak of imperishable fame; we speak of immortality—there is an immortality that remains in the memories of the race, that lives though the individuals die! But there is the greater immortality; and to-day, in the midst of spring time, when the earth is breaking into leaf, we cannot think of death, Mr. Chairman, but we think of those men as having entered through death into a glorious life, that I, at least, believe must be eternal! (Hear, hear.)

But who has a right to praise those who have died for us? From whom, if they came to us, and the wounded who have bled for us,—from whom would they be willing to accept congratulation? Only from those of us, Mr. Chairman, who, if we had the chance, would be willing to do the kind of thing they have done! Only from those of us who recognize that what they died to save is worth our living to maintain! (Applause.) There is one imperishable glory, the imperishable glory of our race, which has been sustained on the field of honor. And that glory must be sustained, if we are worthy of them, by the sacrifice with which we spend ourselves, not only in the months before us, but in the rest of our mortal lives!

We leave this as our expression of gratitude and loving thankfulness, and we only hope that those who have been bereaved will be able to endure with the same courage as those who have gone. (Applause.)

Proceeding next to mention the work of the University, President Falconer said:

It might have been worth while saying something, Mr. Chairman, as you suggested, of what has been done by the University through the war, during the past winter; but in view of this experience through which we have passed, I feel it would be out of place to-day to enlarge upon it. I should like to say something of the work done in our laboratories, of which the public knows little, but where means have been devised of coping with meningitis, and where the tetanus antitoxin has been prepared that is to be used in the hospitals at the front, for which work the Ottawa Government has given us more than \$5,000, we doing the work at cost under the direction of our professor and his staff. I should like to have said something of our Clearing Hospital, in which twenty of our medical graduates are serving, to whom we gave special degrees a few weeks ago. I should like to say something of

our present Base Hospital, to consist of 1,040 beds, as you know, which is being splendidly equipped through the generosity of the people who have contributed in a thoroughly satisfactory way. Also I should like to speak of the work to which you have referred, a work in which twenty or thirty of our professors have been engaged, giving some two hundred lectures throughout the country on the meaning of the war. (Applause.)

I should like to say something about the spirit that has been abroad, about the way the students have rallied—we had from fifteen to eighteen hundred in the Officers' Training Corps, of which the Duke of Connaught spoke in very high terms. A training camp is to be opened at Niagara next month, where in company with men from McGill University, much of their training will be brought to completion. But now it is not wise to linger on such subjects.

Before passing on, however, let me give you some statistics as to the men of the University of Toronto who are now either at the front or preparing to go, who are enlisted, either here or at the front. I think you will be interested in the numbers. Of the staff, including those just about to go, there are fifty-two in service. (Applause.) Of the graduates of the University, there are 388, including 27 of those on the staff—264 officers and 124 in the ranks. These are the last totals we have of our graduates. Of undergraduates, the total on active service is now 440. (Applause.) When you consider that that is probably 20 per cent. of the men who are undergraduates, it is not a bad showing, because more of these will be going in the summer, particularly after the camp closes at Niagara. There is a total from the University of Toronto on actual service at the front or on the way, of nearly 860 men, and we believe that our men will, along with all other Canadians, be worthy of the encomiums that are passed upon them by those who know.

Taking up then the main theme of his address, President Falconer said:

Now in what remains, for twenty minutes, I wish to speak to you in a very brief way, of the policies of Bismarck as they seem to have prepared for the present war.

Bismarck stands out as perhaps the most prominent man in the 19th century and as the creator of the present Germany. He was of the Junker class from East Prussia, the squire class, with all they stand for. As a Junker, as a Prussian, from the beginning of his career he held forth as his aim the welding together of the fragments of the German Em-

pire into one Empire which would realize the ambitions and cherished ideals of the people of Germany for the restoration of what they imagined was the Imperial—the Holy Roman Empire of the Middle Ages.

1. Not to say that their historical conceptions and purpose were thoroughly exact, Bismarck recognized that the German people should be brought into one, and the only possible means of accomplishing his purpose that he could see was to weld them together under the leadership of Prussia, his own old State. From the beginning he believed also that it could only be done by force, so he enunciated his policy of "Blood and Iron."

At a time of great confusion in 1862, when King William, afterwards the Emperor of Prussia, was on the point of abdicating, he called Bismarck to his Council, and asked him whether he would be willing to be his Chancellor, on the basis that he himself had laid down. Bismarck accepted the terms. The basis was that of monarchical absolutism and the development of the Prussian military system. Bismarck gladly adhered to the agreement, and from 1862, when Bismarck first put his heel upon the developing of Parliamentary government, from that day you can trace the gradual disaster which has culminated in what the people to-day suffer. Monarchical absolutism meant with him such rule as that of the Czar of Russia, the Emperor of Austria, possibly the King of Italy. Britain he hated, and France he detested as the home of Red Republicanism. For him, there was nothing between monarchy and republicanism, which he abhorred. For him, Parliamentary government and democracy were nothing but republicanism. At the same time, he announced, more clearly than ever before, and insisted on having the Prussian military system extended, and as far as possible made effective even outside the confines of Prussia. "Blood and Iron" was his policy. Once when the King and Bismarck were standing outside a railway station, the old King turned to Bismarck and said, "If you go on as you are going, they will soon cut off your head under the Opera House there, and mine a few days later." "Your Majesty," replied Bismarck, "you are the First Prussian officer. A Prussian officer was never known to quail in face of duty. If you have to die for your people, die, Your Majesty!" With that, the old King drew himself up, and Bismarck never had any more trouble with him. (Laughter.)

2. Bismarck trampled on the rights of small peoples. In 1864, together with Austria, he absorbed Schleswig and Hol-

stein. You know what treatment he meted out to Poland, and to Alsace-Lorraine afterwards. In 1864 when he was proceeding to absorb Schleswig and Holstein, the more liberally minded Prussians held up their hands in horror as against an act of profligacy. The son of the Emperor, the Crown Prince, afterwards the Emperor Frederick, for a few months, was simply horrified. You find it told in his Memoirs, that when the King said to Bismarck, "I have no right to that property, it is not mine," Bismarck said it was needed, and from that time he noted a psychological change in the old King. That disregard for the rights of the small peoples has been one of the most potent influences in German history since then, for if they had been considered, the present war could not have happened. (Hear, hear.)

Then, in the third place, in 1866 Bismarck defeated Austria, just after Germany had been fighting side by side with Austria two years before. Austria up to that time was the leader of the German peoples; Austria now had to be dispossessed from her hegemony. Shortly afterwards, by the victory of Sadowa, or Königgratz, as it is commonly called, he defeated Austria utterly. The military party was bound to march on Vienna; they said, "That will make our victory complete." But Bismarck refused. He throws out in his Memoirs a reference to the influence of the military in civil matters, saying that they should not be allowed to dictate in civil matters,—I fancy that that policy has not been adhered to in latter years by Germany. After the victory, he said, "Now that we have defeated Austria we shall need to bind them to us." He then began to engineer the war with France; partly because of hatred for France, partly because of the way Napoleon III. was acting, and partly because he felt France was a danger. No matter about the honesty of his scheme: there was little to choose between Napoleon and Bismarck, except that Bismarck was vastly more shrewd, and outmanœuvred his opponent. The Germans leaped together at once, and obtained the needed unity by "Blood and Iron." France, as you know, was defeated, although it took longer to accomplish the victory than he had hoped for.

Now the victory was won, the question arose as to the terms of peace. Bismarck throughout was very severe on France in his terms of peace. Four years before, after defeating Austria, his policy was that Austria was not to be humiliated; but now he determined that France was to be humiliated, and put into a place from which she could not get again into power. Consequently, he demanded an indemnity

which he expected to cripple her; but it did not—she paid the money very much sooner than he expected!

Then there was the question of taking territory. About this different opinions are brought forward: some say Bismarck wanted both Alsace and Lorraine, some say he wanted only Alsace, and was only forced to take Lorraine also. At any rate he wanted Metz; he wanted a wedge placed between the new parts of the German Empire and France. He was afraid France might again attach Bavaria, always susceptible to French influence. Possibly he was afraid of a peaceful penetration by France into the German Empire. At any rate, France was dismembered by taking those old provinces. The people wanted to remain with France; they had been French,—it had been generations since they were Germans. For the next fifteen or twenty years Bismarck's policy of Prussianization irritated the people, when it did not drive them away as exiles. Hohenlohe, the finest in many ways of the German Chancellors,—I don't mean to say the ablest, but the highest-minded, the most gentlemanly,—in his *Memoirs* writes that he urged Bismarck to modify his policy in Alsace and Lorraine. He says: "You are goading the people into rebellion." But Bismarck believed in force. What was the result? You saw it in the Zabern incident the year before last. Alsace and Lorraine are not sympathetic with Prussia, even to-day. By these terms he left in France a rankling wound, and for years she cherished the policy of revenge. Probably, if he had been in any way generous, France would have forgotten her defeat, because it was due partly to her own shortcoming. She is a high-spirited nation. However, as things were, France did not forget.

Then came the alliance between Russia and France, a most curious alliance. France felt that only in some such alliance as that was there any chance against Berlin, which was constantly threatening her. In 1875 Bismarck threatened France, and she knew her danger. Therefore we have the alliance between Russia and France, and if we had no such alliance there would have been no war to-day! Therefore if Bismarck's policy of generous treatment to a foe had been put in practice towards France, a high-spirited people, he would not have left to his successors this harvest of trouble they are reaping to-day.

Last is his treatment of Britain. I have said Bismarck was a Prussian Junker, and inherited the traditions and prejudices of that class. The old intellectual relations between Britain and Germany were very friendly; in fact, the saddest thing

to-day is this rupture of the friendly relations between the two peoples that existed until Bismarck broke them—for he was the first to rupture them. He used the press consistently to sow evil reports; subsidising it so as to be under his own control. He used the press consistently to create ill feeling towards Britain, because Britain represented the principle he hated, the principle as he thought of republican government. He sowed, but he had good helpers, men like Treitschke and others—though Treitschke did not always agree with all of Bismarck's policies.

The growing commercialism—I have not time to go into this fully—led to the production of an atmosphere that was dangerously electric. But the causes lay behind this as I have outlined them. Bismarck's system crushed liberty. But only in the atmosphere of freedom can great men, in succession at least, be trained. You may find a great man thrown up in a despotism, but in that despotism he cannot train up successors. What was the result? Bismarck, holding the threads all in his own hands, would not allow other men alongside him. The Court became full of intrigues, and Bismarck suffered from a revulsion. When the present Emperor came to the throne, it was plain that Bismarck or he would have to be ruler: it did not take long to decide which. But what sort of successors did he leave? Weak men, whose policy has been futile. He was not able to train successors able to understand the psychology of the world of men. Bismarck was strong enough to resist the dangerous elements. He, at least, up to the time of his death, would not have allowed Russia to be alienated. Perhaps other things might have happened, for there have been great changes of late years, which would have forced him. But he set currents moving or gave them volume, and on those currents lesser men have been carried; they could not pull against them, but drifted with their people into this disaster. We can see how the war was coming; by looking back to Bismarck we see where the currents gained their strength. They might have risen behind Bismarck, but their volume is traceable from him. The ship of State has been driving on upon those currents, and I think before long it will be stranded somewhere, and will have to get a new crew; and before it is afloat again it will have to be put in the drydock! (Applause.)

Let me read you one quotation, very striking words, by a French writer in the "*Revue de Paris*," which has just come out: it is one of the most brilliant articles on England that one could read, showing why Germany hates England, and

what idea England stands for, as over against all that Bismarck stands for. This is what this French writer says,—I have made a somewhat rough translation—and it is perhaps worth while to read to-day:

The soul of the archangel of Milton, "which will not be changed either by place or time, which holds in itself its own dwelling and can make in itself of heaven a hell, and of hell a heaven," is the very soul of England, and the first, the highest expression of the inflexible pride, the invincible will of never yielding or submitting, of which she has given so many examples *par la suite*, of which she is giving to-day the supreme example. The root of this energy is in faith and its nourishment is that unique book, The Bible.

It is not only for the sacred Mother Country that her sons from Canada, from Australia, from everywhere, fight, but for the heritage that they get from her, and which like her is menaced; the traditions of liberty, of equal justice, of autonomy, of democracy, which she has given to them, with her blood. They are the creation of the race, her contribution to civilization, and no contribution is greater, more precious, more worthy of being defended at the cost of any sacrifice, at the cost of life itself. It is for the immaterial idea of their race, and not for her material grandeur that they fight: not for a poor mercantilism, the egotistical exploitation of the world, but for the free development in security and peace of their will and energy, the superior fame of a pacific humanity which places right above force and will submit to no tyranny. (Applause.)

That is the Frenchman's view of the soul of England, the greatest possible contrast to what we have seen in Bismarck. (Long applause.)

Following the hearty applause at the conclusion of President Falconer's address, the Nation Anthem was sung, on the suggestion of Mr. N. F. Davidson, K.C., and the annual business of the Canadian Club was then transacted.

Report of Honorary Secretary to Canadian Club, 1915

Mr. President and Gentlemen.—The season of the Canadian Club now at its close may with justice, I think, be described as a highly successful one.

The average attendance, on account of the H. B. Ames evening meeting, (1,600), and the luncheon, (853) at which the Honorable Mr. Taft spoke, reached 367—the Club's high water mark. If the attendances at these two meetings be eliminated the average, however, would be less than that of last year.

While the membership shows a decrease of 151, attributable no doubt to unsettled business conditions, still it is higher than that of the season 1912-13. The very large membership increase last year was due to a special membership campaign, a repetition of which was not considered advisable this year. Twenty members of the Club at present with His Majesty's forces at the front, were elected to Honorary membership by a special resolution of the Club passed in October last—a resolution unique in the history of the Club.

Your committee, in planning the addresses for this year, endeavored to keep them in close touch with war and general European conditions; in the result the addresses have been of wide and varied interest.

Twenty-five Club meetings, regular and special, were held. The following is a list of the meetings, dates, names of speakers and attendance:—

CANADIAN CLUB MEETINGS.

Date of Meeting.	Speaker.	Subject.	Attendance.
1914			
Sept. 14—	H. B. Ames, M.P.	"The British Navy"	1,600
Sept. 21—	Mr. J. W. Flavelle	"The Financial Measures adopted by Great Britain to Meet the Crisis Incident to the War"	335
Oct. 5—	Dr. Adam Shortt, M.A.	"The Effect of the War on Canadian Trade"	350
Oct. 14—	Prof. G. M. Wrong, M.A.	"Why Germany is at War"	375
Oct. 19—	Dr. John A. Amyot	"Sanitation in War"	230

Date of Meeting.	Speaker.	Subject.	Attendance.
1914			
Oct. 27—	Sir Harry Hamilton Johnston, G.C.M.G.	"The German Colonies in South Africa"	335
Nov. 10—	Prof. Wm. Z. Ripley, Ph.D.	"Lessons for Canada from the Railway Experience of United States."	175
Nov. 23—	Prof. J. L. Morison	"The Development of German Policy through the Nineteenth Century"	165
Nov. 30—	Dr. Stephen S. Wise	"The Deeper Causes of the War."	300
Dec. 5—	The Right Hon. Sir R. L. Borden, P.C., K.C.M.G.		425
Dec. 7—	Mr. James M. Lynch	"The Ideals of Trade Unionism and the Attitude of Trade Unions, on the War"	150
Dec. 14—	Lieut.-Col. Wm. Wood	"War—The Neglected Factor in our Problems for a Hundred Years."	180
1915			
Jan. 6—	Prof. Samuel Harper	"Russia and the War"	325
Jan. 13—	Dr. L. E. Brown-Landone	"German Behaviour in Northern France and Belgium"	455
Feb. 1—	Mr. Alex. Dana Noyes	"The United States and the Present War"	405
Feb. 5—	Mr. Cecil Chesterton	"The French Revolution and Modern Europe"	315
Feb. 8—	Prof. A. B. Hart, Ph.D.	"The Near East as a Factor in the European War"	260
Feb. 11—	Hon. Wm. Howard Taft	"The Monroe Doctrine"	853
Feb. 22—	Dr. J. L. Todd	"Are the Tropics Unhealthy for Germans?"	150
Mar. 1—	Prof. A. P. Coleman, M.A.	"The War, as seen from the Far East"	160
Mar. 8—	Dr. R. C. Smith, K.C.	"The Gospel of Force"	264
Mar. 15—	Dr. Chas. Sarolea, K.O.L.	"The Reconstruction of Belgium after the War"	525
Mar. 22—	Hon. Curtis Guild	"Traits of the Russian People"	320
Apr. 15—	Prof. Jno. Macnaughton	"The War and the Bible"	170
Apr. 27—	President R. A. Falconer	"Bismarck's Policy"	250

Reference has been repeatedly made in previous reports to the still unsolved problem of accommodation. This season the Club, making a trial of a plan advocated in the past, rented a floor in the Bond Building, and made special arrangements with Messrs. Coles Limited to cater for the luncheon. The experiment, judging from the general criticism, was successful, and there is a prospect that a permanent solution of this vexed problem along lines more or less similar to those adopted at the Taft luncheon is now in sight. The retiring Executive has forwarded a recommendation to the new Executive to investigate this probable solution with a view to its being tried out next season. This will involve the co-operation of some

of the other City Clubs which have already intimated their willingness to sympathetically consider any feasible plan.

Nine Executive meetings were held during the year, with an average attendance of ten. Numerous informal meetings of the Programme Committee also took place.

Mr. Wilson's high appreciation last year of the services rendered in the past by Mr. Scully, the Assistant Secretary, are here cordially repeated by myself.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

E. PERCIVAL BROWN,
Honorary Secretary.

Report of the Honorary Treasurer

April 27th, 1915.

*To the President and Members of the Canadian Club of
Toronto:—*

While the Club had a remarkably successful year in point of interest in, and attendance at, the meetings that were hold, it is with regret that I report that financially the Club's season does not show up as well as during the past few years. As will be noted from the auditor's statement, which has just been presented, the Club ran behind on the season's operations to the extent of \$170.67, as compared with \$719.62 net revenue increase for the previous season. The decline in the net revenue is accounted for by a decrease in the income from membership fees, etc., of \$428.14. There are 151 fewer members in the Club, and 20 Honorary members, which means that \$513 was lost in membership revenue. The paid membership this season is 1,370, compared with 1,541 for the previous season, a net loss of 171. The number of old members who dropped out during the season was 318, but as there were 147 new members joined, the net loss was reduced to 171. Part of the decrease in fees revenue was made up by increased interest earnings and profit on the Taft luncheon.

It will also be noted that while receipts decreased, the expenditures of the Club increased from \$3,984.46 to \$4,446.61. Your Executive regrets that it was unable to operate the Club on the same budget as last year, but would direct attention to the fact that the deficit was due to the expenses involved in membership in the Association of Canadian Clubs. Before your Executive took office the Club was committed to send a delegate to the Vancouver Convention of the Association of Canadian Clubs, and an expenditure of \$229.50 was incurred in this connection. This was authorized several months before the war, and, therefore, before there was any indication that the Club would have a reduced revenue from fees. The Executive also felt in view of the action of the other larger Clubs, e.g., Montreal, Hamilton, Ottawa, etc., in renewing their special grants of \$100 to the Association of Canadian Clubs, that this Club should do likewise. This made a total expense for

the Association of Canadian Clubs, \$329.50, or \$229.50 more than last season.

The only other item showing a large increase is that of guests' expenses, which totalled this season \$589.86 as compared with \$369.90 for 1913-14. Your Executive feels that these expenditures were necessary to enable the Club to secure speakers of the first rank on war subjects. This year nearly all the speakers brought from distant points to address the Club had their expenses paid; but in no case were fees paid, the Executive having rigidly adhered to the standing rule of the Club that it will not engage professional lecturers to address the Club. The fact that a greater number than usual of those who addressed the Club came from distant points explains the increase in the expenses for guests this season.

Practically all other expenditures were the same as last season, there being slight advances in some, which were more than off-set by reductions under other headings. If the Club had refrained from sending a delegate to the Vancouver Convention the net surplus would have increased by \$50 or more, which would have been very satisfactory in a season such as we have just passed through.

The accumulated surplus of the Club now stands at \$2,527.23 as compared with \$2,697.90 last season, of which \$1,483.99 is invested in bonds, yielding a fraction over 5%. The balance is made up of cash in bank, \$943.24 and \$100 petty cash, making \$1,043.24, which will be quite sufficient to pay for the Year Book which is now on the press, and to carry the Club through the summer months until the fees for 1915-16 are collected in September.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

R. R. LOCKHART,
Honorary Treasurer.

CANADIAN CLUB.

THE CANADIAN CLUB OF TORONTO,
TREASURER'S STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS & PAYMENTS,
SEASON ENDING APRIL, 30TH, 1915.

RECEIPTS.

By Balance in Imperial Bank, Toronto, May 1st, 1914.....	\$1,626.83	
By Petty Cash on hand and in Bank, May 1st, 1914.....	100.00	
By Investment, Owen Sound Debenture, May 1st, 1914....	971.07	
By Membership Fees:—		
Honorary Members, 1914-15, 20 Old		
Members, 1914-15, 1,223 @ \$3.....	\$3,669.00	
New Members, 1914-15, 147 @ \$3..	441.00	
	<hr/>	\$4,110.00
By Interest credited by Imperial Bank..	40.67
By Interest on Berlin Debenture	25.65	
Less accrued interest, deducted from		
Principal	18.13	
	<hr/>	7.52
By Interest on Investment, Owen Sound Debenture		50.00
By Amount realized over expenses of Taft lunch-		
eon, per statement	67.75	
	<hr/>	4,275.94
By Canadian Patriotic Association re Ames Meeting, see		
contra		334.23
		<hr/>
		\$7,308.07

PAYMENTS.

To Accounts chargeable to the Season ended April		
30, 1914	\$987.84	
To Assistant Secretary-Treasurer's Honorarium ..	1,000.00	
To Printing Notice Cards and Stationery.....	270.90	
To Telegraph Accounts	28.82	
To Telephone Accounts	49.00	
To Postage, postcards and petty cash disburse-		
ments	530.29	
To Sundries	28.40	
To Catering	506.25	
To Reporting	125.75	
To Guests' Expenses	589.86	
To Association of Canadian Clubs—special con-		
tribution	100.00	
To Delegate's Expenses to Convention, Associa-		
tion of Canadian Clubs, Vancouver, B.C....	229.50	
	<hr/>	4,446.61
To Canadian Patriotic Association re Ames meeting		334.23

SURPLUS.

Petty Cash on hand and in Bank	\$100.00	
Investment, Owen Sound debenture	971.07	
Investment, City of Berlin debenture ...	\$531.05	
Less accrued Interest	18.13	
	<hr/>	512.92
Balance in Imperial Bank, Toronto	943.24	
	<hr/>	2,527.23
		<hr/>
		\$7,308.07

CANADIAN CLUB.

275

THE CANADIAN CLUB OF TORONTO. COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND PAY- MENTS FOR THREE SEASONS ENDED APRIL 30TH, 1913, 1914 AND 1915.

RECEIPTS.

	1912-13	1913-14	1914-15
Income from Membership Fees, Inter- est, etc.	\$3,823.33	\$4,704.08	\$4,275.94

PAYMENTS.

Club Expenses	3,471.81	3,984.46	4,446.61
Net Revenue earned by years.....	\$351.52	\$719.62	\$170.67
Surplus brought forward from previous years	1,626.76	1,978.28	2,697.90
Accumulated Surplus by years	\$1,978.28	\$2,697.90	\$2,527.23

LIST OF MEMBERS

1914-15

A

Abbs, C. E.
Acres, Chas. R.
Adair, John.
Adam, George.
Adam, G. G.
Adams, E. Herbert.
Adams, J. Frank.
Adamson, Agar.
Addison, W. L. T.
Agar, Chas. J.
Aikins, H. W.
Alcock, T. B.
Alderson, W. H.
Alexander, W. H.
Allan, W. A.
Allen, J. B.
Allen, Thos.
Ames, A. E.
Amyot, J. A.
Anderson, A. C.
Anderson, C. W.
Anderson, H. W.
Anderson, Wallace.
Andrew, R. B.
Andrews, E. B.
Anglin, R. W.
Anglin, S. E.
Annandale, A. W.
Anthes, L. L.
Appleby, F. L.
Archibald, J. W.
Arkell, Robert.
Armbrast, D. K.

Armour, E. N.
Armstrong, A. E.
Armstrong, J. J.
Arnup, J. H.
Ashworth, Ed. M.
Aspden, T. Fred.
Atherton, J. W.
Atkinson, D. H.
Auld, A. R.
Austin, Wm. R.
Authors, Hartley G.

B

Bach, J. S.
Bach, W. A.
Back, W. G.
Bailey, C. F.
Bailey, Fred S.
Baillie, F. W.
Baillie, J. W.
Bain, W. A.
Baker, E. G.
Baker, J. Chas.
Baker, R. L.
Baker, S. A.
Baker, W. H.
Baldwin, L. H.
Ball, G. B.
Ballantyne, A. W.
Balm, Henry.
Banfield, E. J.
Banfield, W. H.
Barber, R. A.
Barker, H. W.

- Barker, R. J. W.
Barr, Walter J.
Barrett, J. H.
Barrett, W. W.
Bastedo, A. E.
Bates, Gordon.
Batten, A. C.
Baxter, D. W.
Beamish, W. G.
Beard, M. D.
Beaton, John W.
Beatty, H. A.
Beatty, J. W.
Beaulieu, G. A.
Beck, E. L.
Beecroft, F. L.
Beemer, A. A.
Beemer, A. H.
Beer, E. G.
Beer, G. Frank.
Begg, E. A.
Belcher, A. E.
Bell, A. J.
Bell-Smith, F. M.
Bender, C. A.
Bertram, Geo. M.
Bethune, A. B.
Bickle, E. W.
Bilger, W. F.
Bilton, N. C.
Binnie, A. W.
Binnie, J. L.
Birchard, I. J.
Bird, E. G.
Bird, T. A.
Bishop, C. H.
Bishop, G. J.
Bishop, R. H.
Blachford, A. W.
Blachford, Chas. E.
Blachford, F. E.
Blachford, H. C.
Black, J. C.
Black, R. G.
Black, S. W.
Black, W. A.
Black, Wm.
Blackburn, A. R.
Blackburn, F. J.
Blackburn, Herbert.
Blacklock, S. C.
Blain, Hugh.
Bland, Thos.
Bleasdall, W. H.
Blogg, A. E.
Blogg, T. Lyle.
Bole, W. W.
Bollard, Arthur.
Bond, F. F.
Bone, J. R.
Bongard, C. W.
Bonnar, H. D.
Book, D. K.
Booth, Wm.
Bowen, Thos. P.
Bowles, H. W.
Bowman, W. M.
Boyd, George.
Boylen, J. C.
Bradshaw, Thos.
Brecken, P. R.
Breckenridge, E. A.
Breckenridge, J. C.
Brent, W. C.
Briggs, A. A.
Briggs, A. W.
Bristol, Everett.
Bristol, J. R. K.
Britnell, Albert.
Britnell, A.
Brock, S. G.
Brooks, W.
Broughton, J. R. Y.
Brown, B. R.
Brown, C. A. B.
Brown, T. Crawford.
Brown, E. B.
Brown, E. P.
Brown, H. S.
Brown, James.
Brown, Jas. H.
Brown, Richard.
Brown, W. E.
Brown, W. N.

Brown, W. T. G.
 Browne, W. H.
 Bruce, H. A.
 Bruce, John.
 Bruce, R. J.
 Bryden, Jas.
 Bucke, Wm.
 Buckland, H. G.
 Bull, Emerson.
 Bull, J. H.
 Bull, W. P.
 Bulley, Chas.
 Bundy, J. W.
 Burgess, C. H.
 Burnett, A. H.
 Burnett, H. E.
 Burns, A. N.
 Burns, C. E.
 Burns, J. A.
 Burns, R. N.
 Burr, W. H.
 Burroughes, C. R.
 Burton, C. L.
 Bushell, Amos.
 Bustard, R. C.
 Butchart, A. S.
 Butt, H. A.

C

Calhoun, J. C.
 Cameron, D.
 Cameron, D. A.
 Cameron, K. L.
 Cameron, M. H. V.
 Cameron, W. A.
 Campbell, A. M.
 Campbell, C. C.
 Campbell, E. T.
 Campbell, G. C.
 Campbell, J. L.
 Campbell, K.
 Campbell, W. F.
 Candee, C. N.
 Candee, C. N., Jr.
 Canfield, F. B.
 Carnahan, W. J. A.
 Carr, W.

Carrick, John.
 Carter, J. S.
 Carveth, J. A.
 Case, T. A.
 Caskey, H. K.
 Cassidy, E.
 Caswell, E. S.
 Catto, J. A.
 Causton, E. N.
 Caven, J. G.
 Chadsey, S. B.
 Chamberlin, J. E.
 Chant, W. A.
 Chapin, A. S.
 Chapman, W. F.
 Charlton, W. A.
 Chatterson, A. E.
 Cherry, P. G.
 Chisholm, A.
 Chisholm, R. W.
 Chown, S. D.
 Christie, R. J.
 Clancy, W. T.
 Clapperton, H. G.
 Clare, Harvey.
 Clark, G. F.
 Clark, G. M.
 Clark, Harold.
 Clark, J. M.
 Clark, L. J.
 Clark, W. J.
 Clarke, F. G.
 Clarke, G. B.
 Clarke, W. F.
 Clarke, W. J.
 Clarkson, C. H.
 Clarkson, F. G.
 Clarkson, Roger.
 Cleaver, S.
 Cleland, F. A.
 Clemes, H. B.
 Clements, A. G.
 Clendennan, G. W.
 Cliff, W. C.
 Coakwell, J. A.
 Coatsworth, E. T.
 Cockburn, E.

Cody, H. J.
Cooper Cole, C. E.
Coleman, R. H.
Collinson, Frank.
Colquhoun, A. H. U.
Congdon, J. W.
Connell, F. M.
Cook, M. H.
Coombs, F. J.
Coombs, J. W.
Coon, H. J.
Cooper, J. A.
Cooper, J. E.
Coote, J. C.
Copeland, C. M.
Copeland, R. J.
Corcoran, J. W.
Corner, H. C.
Corrigan, F. S.
Corrigan, W. J.
Corson, R. R.
Costello, T.
Coulson, D. A.
Coulter, J. A.
Couzens, H. H.
Cowan, John.
Cowan, Wm.
Craick, W. A.
Craig, Jas.
Craig, Jas. H.
Craig, Wm.
Crane, S.
Crawford, H. J.
Crean, G. C.
Creer, F. N.
Creighton, W. B.
Cringan, J. W.
Croft, Wm.
Crosby, G. W.
Crossland, E. F.
Crowe, H. J.
Crowther, W. B.
Crowther, W. C.
Cummer, W. E.
Cuthbertson, A. E.
Cuthbertson, C. R.
Cutten, L. F.

D

Dale, J. G.
Dallyn, F. A.
Dallyn, R. E.
Daly, H. J.
Daly, R. A.
Dancy, A. H.
Dancy, R. C.
Daniel, C. D.
Daniel, F. C.
Darby, W. J.
Davidson, G. A.
Davidson, N. F.
Davidson, Richard.
Davies, E. S.
Davies, M. L.
Davies, T. A.
Davis, B. N.
Davis, B. N.
Davis, E. J.
Davis, L.
Day, F. J.
Deacon, F. H.
Deacon, G. P.
Dean, W. F.
Dean, W. G.
Dench, F. E.
Denison, G. T.
Denison, Shirley.
Denne, A. J.
Dent, C. R.
Denton, Frank.
Detweiler, J. A.
Dick, John.
Dignum, E. J.
Dilworth, R. J.
Dineen, F. B.
Dineen, W. F.
Dingman, R. G.
Dinnick, W. S.
Dobbs, J. E.
Doherty, G. F. B.
Donaldson, A. G.
Donly, H. W.
Donogh, J. O.
Doolittle, P. E.

Doran, F. W.
 Douglas, W. M.
 Douglass, W. A.
 Doyle, J.
 Duffett, W. G.
 Duggan, R. B.
 Duggan, T. W.
 Duncan, E. J. B.
 Duncan, J. M.
 Dunlap, D. A.
 Dunlop, W. R.
 Dunstan, K. J.
 Dyke, F. G.
 Dykes, Philip.

E

Earl, T. R.
 Easson, R. H.
 Eaton, J. C., Sir.
 Eaton, R. W.
 Eaton, R. Y.
 Eayrs, H. S.
 Eby, Hugh D.
 Eby, W. P.
 Echlin, J. A.
 Eckardt, A. E.
 Eckardt, A. J. H.
 Eckardt, H. P.
 Eddis, Chas. S.
 Eddis, J. W.
 Eddis, W. C.
 Edgeworth, John.
 Edmonds, C. E.
 Elgie, R. B.
 Elliott, A.
 Elliott, T.
 Elliott, W. F.
 Ellis, A. W.
 Ellis, J. A.
 Ellis, J. F.
 Ellis, P. W.
 Ellis, R. Y.
 Ellis, W. G.
 Elmore, T. S.
 Emslie, B. L.
 Endicott, J.
 Evans, G. T.

Evans, L. C.
 Evans, W. B.

F

Fairbairn, R. D.
 Fairley, H. T.
 Fairty, I. S.
 Falconer, R. A.
 Farewell, F. L.
 Farquharson, Jas.
 Farr, H. Y.
 Fawcett, W. J.
 Fearnley, Wm.
 Fennell, W. J.
 Ferguson, J. B.
 Ferguson, J. M.
 Fetherstonhaugh, F. B.
 Field, F. W.
 Fielding, Ed.
 File, L. K.
 Finch, G. T.
 Findley, Thos.
 Finkle, E. D.
 Firstbrook, W.
 Fisher, A. B.
 Fisher, B. F.
 Fisher, J.
 Fisher, R. C.
 Fitzgerald, J. G.
 Flavelle, J. E.
 Flavelle, J. W.
 Fleming, C. H.
 Fleming, J. H.
 Fletcher, A. G.
 Foley, F. J.
 Ford, T. S.
 Forster, J. W. L.
 Fortier, H. C.
 Foster, A. S.
 Foster, C. L.
 Foster, S. B. R.
 Foster, S. H.
 Foulds, A.
 Fountain, Wm.
 Fox, E. C.
 Fox, J. J.
 Fox, W. C.

Foy, F. C.
 Frankel, Leo.
 Franks, Harold.
 Fraser, G. W.
 Fraser, J. A.
 Fraser, R. D.
 Fraser, W. J.
 French, D. G.
 Frind, M. A.
 Frost, H. R.
 Fullerton, J. A.

G

Gaby, F. A.
 Galbraith, G. M.
 Gale, G. C.
 Gallagher, Z.
 Gardner, J. M.
 Garlick, H. S.
 Gartshore, J. J.
 Garvin, J. W.
 Gates, F. W.
 George, James.
 George, W. K.
 Gibson, D. H.
 Gibson, J. J.
 Gibson, R. E.
 Gibson, Theron.
 Gibson, Thos.
 Gibson, T. A.
 Gilbert, G. A. E.
 Gilchrist, Jas.
 Gilchrist, John.
 Gillespie, Walter.
 Gillies, D. B.
 Gillooly, C. J.
 Gilmour, C. H.
 Gilmour, J. T.
 Gilverson, A. E.
 Gissing, Edwin.
 Glackmeyer, F. I.
 Gladman, J. G.
 Godfrey, J. M.
 Godson, T. E.
 Goforth, W. F.
 Golder, M. T.
 Goldsmith, P.

Goodenow, A. H.
 Gooderham, G. H.
 Gooderham, Henry.
 Gooderham, H. F.
 Gordon, A. R.
 Gouinlock, Geo.
 Gould, R. J.
 Goulding, Joseph.
 Gourlay, R. S.
 Gow, Walter.
 Gower, Edwin P.
 Graham, G. W.
 Graham, Wm. M.
 Grange, E. A. A.
 Grant, W. H.
 Grassick, F. C.
 Gray, F. M.
 Gray, G. H.
 Gray, Wm. A.
 Green, G. F.
 Green, H. E. W.
 Greenshields, G. A.
 Gregory, W. D.
 Greig, E. R.
 Greig, W. J.
 Griffin, Watson.
 Grimby, Maurice.
 Grover, G. A.
 Grubbe, T. P.
 Grundy, E. C.
 Gulley, C. L.
 Gulley, Thos.
 Gundy, J. H.
 Gundy, W. P.
 Gunther, R. E.
 Gurney, E. H.
 Gzowski, C. S.

H

Haddy, C. H.
 Haig, D. C.
 Hale, E. R.
 Hales, Jas.
 Hall, A. F.
 Hall, H. E.
 Hall, J. B.
 Hall, J. E.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

283

- Hallam, J.
Halliday, Roy.
Halpenny, E. W.
Halsted, T. A.
Hamilton, R. C.
Hamilton, W. A.
Hammond, M. O.
Haney, M. J.
Hanna, H. G.
Hanna, W. J.
Harcourt, F. W.
Harcourt, R. B.
Harding, C. V.
Hardy, G. B.
Hardy, H. R.
Harper, E. W.
Harris, H. K.
Harris, Jas.
Harris, R. C.
Hart, H. B.
Hart, J. S.
Hart, M. M.
Hart, Percy.
Hastings, Chas. J.
Hatch, A. E.
Hathaway, E. J.
Hawes, A.
Haworth, G. F.
Hay, C. McD.
Hayes, F. B.
Hearst, H. V.
Heaven, W. J.
Hedley, Jas.
Henderson, C. D.
Henderson, David.
Henderson, Jos.
Henderson, L. A.
Henderson, P. E.
Henderson, R. B.
Henderson, S.
Henderson, T. A.
Hendry, A.
Henry, D. E.
Hermant, Percy.
Hessin, A. E.
Hetherington, W. J.
Hethrington, J. A.
Hewitt, Arthur.
Heyes, S. T.
Hezzelwood, O.
Higgins, A. T.
Higgins, F. P.
Hill, C. E.
Hill, N. A.
Hillary, N.
Hillery, W. O.
Hillman, H. P. L.
Hillock, C. W.
Hillock, J. F.
Hiltz, W. W.
Hindmarsh, H. C.
Hobberlin, A. M.
Hodgins, F. E.
Hodgkinson, C. I.
Hoidge, W. H.
Holden, J. B.
Holliday, F. T.
Hooper, H.
Hopkins, C. F.
Hopkins, H.
Hopkins, J. C.
Hopper, L. R.
Hornby, R.
Horner, L. O.
Horton, E. E.
Horton, H. G.
Horwood, J. C. B.
Hough, E. W.
Houston, Wm.
Howard, E. A. E.
Howard, S. W.
Howarth, C. E.
Howe, L. P.
Howell, D. J.
Howell, G. A.
Howes, E. J.
Howitt, Henry.
Howland, G. W.
Howland, Peleg.
Huckvale, C.
Hudson, H. H.
Huestis, A. E.
Huestis, A. M.
Huffman, Louis.

Hughes, J. L.
Hull, H.
Hutchinson, A.
Hutchison, O. A.
Hutton, M.
Hynes, J. P.

I

Imrie, J. M.
Inglee, J. F.
Innes, W. C. C.
Inrig, Wm.
Ireland, H. W.
Irish, M. H.
Irvine, R. N.
Irvine, W. H.
Irving, G. T.
Irving, T. C., jr.
Ivens, E. H.
Ivey, A. M.

J

Jackson, H. R.
Jacobs, F. A.
James, C. C.
James, C. W.
James, D. D.
James, T. B.
Jamieson, P.
Jarvis, E. M.
Jarvis, F. C.
Jarvis, J. B.
Jarvis, W. H. P.
Jefferis, C. A.
Jeffrey, A. H.
Jenking, E. J.
Jephcott, W. C.
Jewell, H.
Johns, S. H.
Johnson, A. J.
Johnson, Main.
Johnston, Alfred.
Jones, C. S.
Jones, J. E.
Jones, L. M., Sir.

Jones, T. R.
Jones, W. A. M.
Jones, Wm. W.
Jordan, A. R.
Joselin, S. W.
Joyce, B. F.
Jull, T. W.

K

Keele, C. C.
Keeler, P. A.
Keirstead, E. M.
Keith, Alex.
Keith, D. L.
Keith, G. A.
Keith, J. M.
Kelley, N. P.
Kemp, W. A.
Kennedy, C. A.
Kennedy, H. L.
Keough, T. H.
Kerr, J. H. S.
Kerr, J. K.
Kertland, A. H. R.
Kettlewell, W. C.
Keys, D. R.
Kiely, P. G.
King, A. C.
King, A. E.
King, E. E.
Kingsmill, W. B.
Kingston, G. A.
Kinnear, Thos.
Kirby, R. G.
Kirkpatrick, A. D.
Kirkpatrick, A. M. M.
Kirkwood, J. C.
Kirkwood, W. A.
Klotz, E. W.
Knight, F. J.
Knowles, Geo.
Knowles, P. D.
Kronick, S.
Kyle, J. C.
Kylie, E. J.
Kynoch, Jas.

L

Lacey, J. C. T.
 Lacey, L. A.
 Laidlaw, A. T.
 Laidlaw, J. B.
 Laidlaw, Robt.
 Laidlaw, R. A.
 Laidlaw, W. C.
 Laird, Alex.
 Laird, G. G.
 Laird, Robt.
 Lake, E. M.
 Lambe, W. G. A.
 Lander, Jas.
 Lander, N. J.
 Lang, D. W.
 Langlois, H.
 Langlois, W. H.
 Langman, A. E.
 Langstaff, J. M.
 Langton, W. A.
 Larkin, P. C.
 Larsen, C. N.
 Laschinger, E. H.
 Lash, J. F.
 Lash, Z. G.
 Lawrence, E. W.
 Leadley, A.
 Leask, D. R.
 Lee, C. E.
 Lee, G. H. D.
 Lee, P. J.
 Lee, W. C.
 Leeming, Thos.
 Lefroy, A. H. F.
 LeMesurier, C. C.
 Leonard, C. J.
 Lewis, E. A.
 Lewis, J. D.
 Lewis, R. T.
 Lightbourn, E. T.
 Lindsay, J.
 Lindsay, John.
 Lindsay, Martine.
 Lindsey, G. G. S.
 Lines, S. L. B.
 Littlejohn, J. L. B.

Livingston, C. W.
 Lloyd, H. F.
 Locke, G. H.
 Locke, J. T.
 Lockhart, R. R.
 Long, A. E.
 Long, W. E.
 Louks, LeRoy.
 Lovell, J. S.
 Lovering, W. J.
 Lucas, I. B.
 Lucas, Jos.
 Lugsdin, L. J.
 Luke, F. E.
 Lyon, A. E.
 Lyons, J. P.
 Lytle, W. J.

M

McArthur, C. A.
 McArthur, E. L.
 McCammon, L. B.
 McCannell, J. S.
 McCarthy, J. O.
 McClain, R. W.
 McClellan, E. E.
 McClellan, W. H.
 McClelland, J.
 McColm, E. E.
 McConkey, T. G.
 McCoy, S. H.
 McCracken, T. E.
 McCrea, W. J.
 McCredie, A. L.
 McCullough, J. W. S.
 McDonald, C. S.
 McDougall, D. H.
 McEachren, N. C.
 McEachren, W. N.
 McFall, A. A.
 McGavin, H.
 McGee, Henry.
 McGonegal, E.
 McGuire, W. H.
 McIlwraith, W. N.
 McIntosh, J. M.
 McIntosh, W. D.

McIntyre, D. M.	MacIntyre, G.
McIntyre, R. L.	Mack, L. E.
McKay, A. C.	Mackay, F. D.
McKechnie, J. B.	MacKay, John.
McKenzie, B. E.	MacKay, J. F.
McKinnon, J. G.	MacKelcan, F. R.
McKinnon, J. S.	Mackenzie, A. J.
McKinnon, R. B.	MacKenzie, D. R.
McKinnon, R. S.	MacKenzie, J. A.
McKinnon, W. L.	MacKenzie, S. H. P.
McKinnon, W. M.	MacKerrow, R.
McKnight, J.	MacLachlan, J. P.
McLaren, D.	MacLaren, J. F.
McLaughlin, F. S.	MacLean, J. M.
McLaughlin, R. J.	MacMahon, H. W.
McLaughlin, R. S.	MacMurchy, A.
McLean, F. G.	MacMurchy, J. C.
McLean, J. S.	Macnab, F. J.
McLean, W. J.	Macpherson, G. A.
McLeod, G. J.	Macrae, E. M.
McLeod, J. B.	Mahony, R. J.
McMahon, F.	Malcolm, A. G.
McMichael, A. R.	Mallon, J. P.
McMichael, S. B.	Mann, C. C.
McMurray, L. S.	Mann, D. D.
McNairn, W. H.	Mann, F. J.
McNaught, W. K.	Manning, H. E.
McNicoll, J. A.	Mara, F. G.
McPherson, R. U.	Mara, W. H.
McQuillen, T.	Marks, A. H. S.
McWhinney, J. M.	Marshall, G. L.
McWhinney, W. J.	Marshall, W. J.
Mabee, O. H.	Martin, H. G.
Macbeth, W. J.	Martin, Wm.
Macdonald, A. A.	Martin, W. H.
MacDonald, C. S.	Martin, Wm. T.
Macdonald, D.	Mason, A. D. A.
Macdonald, D. B.	Mason, D. H. C.
Macdonald, H. W.	Mason, H. H.
Macdonald, J. A.	Mason, I. H.
MacDonald, J. A.	Mason, T. H.
Macdonald, W. R.	Massey, A. L.
Macdougall, A. K.	Massey, Vincent.
MacDougall, A. R.	Mathews, J. B.
Macfadden, J. A.	Matthews, W. L.
MacGregor, J. P.	Mathison, Robt.
MacInnes, B. S.	Maw, F. C.
MacInnes, C. S.	Maybee, J. E.

Medland, J.
Meredith, Thos.
Merriam, G. R. C.
Meyers, D. C.
Mickles, L. G.
Miles, A. W.
Millard, F. P.
Millichamp, R.
Millichamp, W.
Millman, Thos.
Millman, W. H.
Mills, Alex.
Milner, W. S.
Milnes, J. H.
Milnes, J. P.
Mitchell, A. J.
Mitchell, C. H.
Mitchell, C. S. F.
Mitchell, J. W.
Mitchell, Thos.
Moffatt, F. M.
Moffatt, W. J.
Monypenny, L. F.
Monypenny, T. F.
Moody, F. H.
Moore, J. T.
Moore, S. J.
Moore, W. P.
Morgan, E. R.
Morgan, M. T.
Morley, R. B.
Morren, E. W. S.
Morris, Cecil.
Morrison, C. E.
Morrow, A. D.
Morrow, G. A.
Morrow, W. B.
Mortimer, C. H.
Mortimer, Thos.
Moss, Fred.
Moss, Wm.
Mowat, G. S.
Moyle, David.
Muckle, C. P.
Muirhead, J. A.
Mulholland, A. A.
Mulholland, F. A.
Mulock, Cawthra.

Mulock, Wm., Jr.
Munro, C. R.
Munro, Hugh.
Munroe, E. B.
Munroe, E. S.
Murdock, J. Y.
Murphy, J. E.
Murray, C. B.
Murray, H. W.
Murray, W. P.
Musselman, J. D.

N

Nasmith, H. C.
Needler, G. H.
Neely, C. H.
Neely, T. A.
Nelles, C. M.
Nelson, F.
Nesbitt, W.
Nightingale, Hy.
Niles, C. B.
Nisbet, R. A.
Nix, H. W.
Noble, C. J.
Northway, A. G.
Northway, John.
Northway, J. A.
Nourse, C. E.

O

Oakley, J.
O'Brien, A. H.
O'Connor, J.
O'Connor, W. M.
O'Donoghue, J. G.
O'Hara, G. H.
Ogle, E. W.
Oldham, J. H.
Oliver, Jos.
O'Meara, T. R.
O'Reilly, H. R.
Ormsby, R. P.
Orr, W. H.
Overend, M. A.

P

Page, Wm. A.
Pakenham, Wm.
Palm, O. G.
Palmer, C. E.
Park, Andrew.
Park, A. F.
Parker, Robt.
Parker, W. R. P.
Parkhill, J. H.
Parkinson, M.
Parsons, R. C.
Parsons, S. R.
Parton, G. F.
Paterson, H. D.
Paterson, J. A.
Paterson, J. H.
Patterson, E. L. S.
Patterson, J. H. L.
Payne, A. R.
Paynter, C. J.
Peacock, E. R.
Pearce, C. T.
Pearce, W. K.
Pearson, A.
Pearson, W. H.
Peasnell, F. W.
Pemberton, G. C. T.
Pepler, Eric.
Perry, Geo. D.
Perry, W. H.
Peters, G. A.
Peters, Henry.
Peterson, H. R.
Pettes, D. H.
Pettit, J. H.
Phillips, Chas.
Philips, H. S.
Phippen, F. H.
Plant, W. H.
Platt, S. A.
Plaxton, G. G.
Plumptre, H. P.
Pontifex, B.
Poole, C. D.
Poole, J. E.
Pope, W. W.

Porter, G. D.
Potts, F. H.
Poucher, F. B.
Price, W. H.
Priest, H. C.
Prime, F. A.
Prime, F. H.
Primrose, A.
Provan, A.
Prudham, J. R.
Putnam, G. A.

R

Rae, H. C.
Ramsay, J. J.
Randall, A. E.
Raney, W. E.
Raper, S. E.
Ratcliffe, J. B.
Rea, A. E.
Readman, C. W.
Redman, H. E.
Reed, W. G. C.
Reed, Wm. L.
Reid, A. J.
Reid, A. T.
Reid, A. W.
Reid, C. E.
Reid, G. B.
Reid, J. A.
Reid, Thos.
Rennie, R.
Rennie, Thos.
Rice, A. B.
Rice, Gordon.
Richards, E. H.
Richardson, C. F.
Richardson, J. E.
Richardson, R. D.
Richey, M. S. L.
Riddel, J. H.
Ridout, Geo.
Ritchie, C. F.
Roadhouse, W. B.
Roberts, F. E.
Robertson, A.
Robertson, A. R.

Robertson, C. S.
 Robertson, W. D.
 Robertson, W. G.
 Robin, C. E.
 Robinette, T. C.
 Robins, F. B.
 Robins, M. E.
 Robinson, E. W.
 Robinson, J. B.
 Robinson, M. H.
 Robinson, R. K.
 Robson, A. H.
 Rogers, A. C.
 Rogers, Elias.
 Rogers, E. A.
 Rogers, J. P.
 Rogers, T. G.
 Rohold, S. B.
 Rooke, C. H.
 Rooke, Henry.
 Rooney, W. J.
 Rorke, L. V.
 Rose, J. J.
 Ross, D. G.
 Ross, D. W.
 Ross, J. F.
 Ross, R. D.
 Ross, Victor.
 Ross, W. D.
 Rous, H. L.
 Rowell, N. W.
 Rowland, F. J.
 Rowland, J. A.
 Rowland, W. A.
 Rowlatt, F. A.
 Rudolf, R. D.
 Rumsey, R. A.
 Rundle, W. E.
 Rupert, H. S.
 Russell, T. A.
 Rutherford, E. E.
 Rutter, A. F.
 Ryan, H. G. A.
 Ryrie, Harry.
 Ryrie, James.

S

Saer, J. B.
 Salmond, J. J.
 Sanderson, H. M.
 Saunders, E. M.
 Scheuer, E.
 Scott, C. G.
 Scott, E. W.
 Scott, F. W.
 Scott, J. C.
 Scripture, A. W.
 Scully, H. D.
 Scythes, E. C.
 Seaman, W. B.
 Sewell, H. F. D.
 Shapley, H. W.
 Sharp, Andrew.
 Shaver, Geo. H.
 Shaw, J. A.
 Shaw, W. H.
 Sheen, H. L.
 Shenstone, J. N.
 Sheppard, L. C.
 Sheppard, S. T.
 Shiels, M. S.
 Silverthorn, G.
 Silverthorn, T. A.
 Sime, T. W.
 Simonski, I.
 Sims, P. H.
 Simser, J. W.
 Sinclair, J. M.
 Sinclair, S. B.
 Sisley, O.
 Sisson, W. J.
 Skeaff, J. S.
 Sloan, C. J.
 Smallpiece, H. E.
 Smart, Wm.
 Smith, A. T.
 Smith, E. H.
 Smith, F. D. L.
 Smith, F. J.
 Smith, F. S.

Smith, G. B.
 Smith, G. H.
 Smith, H. L.
 Smith, J. M.
 Smith, R. G.
 Smith, R. Home.
 Smith, V. R.
 Smith, W. H.
 Smith, W. R.
 Snarr, J. F.
 Snively, A. C.
 Snyder, N.
 Somers, G. T.
 Somerville, J.
 Southam, R.
 Sparrow, J. M.
 Speight, T. B.
 Spence, B. H.
 Spence, F. S.
 Sprague, H. S.
 Sproatt, G. R.
 Squirrel, J. E.
 Standfield, M. E.
 Stanley, Frank.
 Stanners, A. C.
 Stanton, O. B.
 Stapells, R. A.
 Stark, H. L.
 Steele, G. J.
 Steele, J. J.
 Steele, R. C.
 Steele, W. D.
 Steinhoff, I. W.
 Stephenson, F. C.
 Stevens, W. R.
 Stevenson, C. E.
 Stewart, A. F.
 Stewart, E.
 Stewart, H. B.
 Stewart, Wm.
 Stewart, Wm. B.
 Stewart, W. D.
 Stobie, M.
 Stock, H. E. R.
 Stone, W. T.
 Storrie, Wm.
 Stovel, A. E.

Strathy, F. W.
 Strathy, Stuart.
 Strathy, Winder.
 Stuart, R. J.
 Sutherland, A.
 Sutherland, Hy.
 Sutherland, J. A.
 Sutherland, R. F.
 Sutton, T. E. P.
 Swan, D. A.
 Sweatman, J. W.
 Sweeny, Bishop.
 Sykes, S. B.
 Symmes, B. H. L.
 Symmes, L. R.
 Symons, D. T.

T

Tanner, F. W.
 Tate, J. A.
 Taylor, H. A.
 Temple, H. P.
 Temple, W. M.
 Tew, Richard.
 Thayer, Ira B.
 Thompson, B.
 Thompson, H. V.
 Thomson, A.
 Thomson, A. M.
 Thomson, H. G.
 Thomson, J. H.
 Thorold, F. W.
 Thurston, A. D.
 Tindall, W. B.
 Tippet, W. H.
 Torrington, F. H.
 Tory, John A.
 Tow, W. J.
 Trigge, A. St. L.
 Trotter, W. C.
 Troyer, H. L.
 Tubby, C. A.
 Turnbull, Jno.
 Turnbull, W. G.
 Tyrrell, H. V.

U

Urquhart, Thos.

V

Vale, P. A.
 Valetine, Geo.
 Van Norman, C. C.
 Van Nostrand, A. J.
 Van Nostrand, C. I.
 Van Nostrand, G. J.
 Van Nostrand, Jno.
 Vanstone, B. S.
 Van Vleet, P. G.
 Vaughan, R. C.
 Vaughan, Wm. H.
 Vearncombe, H. C.
 Vigeon, Harry.
 Vonszeliski, Paul.

W

Wade, R. O.
 Wade, Wm. C.
 Wainwright, C. S.
 Walder, Robt.
 Walker, C.
 Walker, E., Sir.
 Walker, H. H.
 Walker, J. A.
 Walker, Wm.
 Wallace, J. S.
 Wallace, M. W.
 Ward, A. T.
 Warden, G. T.
 Wardlaw, T. D.
 Warren, C. A.
 Warren, J. M.
 Warren, R. D.
 Warren, T.
 Warwick, G. R.
 Watson, G. F.
 Watson, Wm.
 Watt, John.
 Webb, G. H.
 Webb, R. H.
 Webber, L. V.
 Webster, T. S.
 Wedd, E. K. N.
 Weld, H. F.
 West, Thos.

West, W. N.
 Westren, J.
 Wetherell, Elgin.
 Wetherell, J. E.
 Whaley, E.
 Whatmough, A. E.
 White, Aubrey.
 White, F. F.
 White, F. J.
 White, F. W.
 White, Geo.
 White, J. P.
 White, M. A.
 White, M. P.
 Whittemore, A. R.
 Whyte, A.
 Wickett, S. M.
 Wickett, S. R.
 Wickson, John.
 Wickware, R. C.
 Wiggins, Wm.
 Wildman, J. F.
 Wilkie, Geo.
 Wilkinson, E. H.
 Wilkinson, W. C.
 Willans, Ed.
 Willard, J. C.
 Willard, W. T.
 Williams, C. E.
 Williams, H. B.
 Williams, H. H.
 Williamson, R.
 Willison, Sir J.
 Willison, W. A.
 Willson, C. H.
 Willson, G. H.
 Willson, John.
 Wilson, A. E.
 Wilson, C. L.
 Wilson, G. E.
 Wilson, Geo.
 Wilson, G. L.
 Wilson, G. P.
 Wilson, H.
 Wilson, Jno.
 Wilson, M. F.
 Wilson, S. F.
 Wilton, R. F.

Winchester, A. B.
Winger, A. H.
Winter, F. W.
Winter, H. N.
Winter, L. A.
Winyard, C. W.
Wise, W. H.
Withers, C. A.
Wood, E. R.
Wood, G. H.
Wood, L. N.
Wood, Robt.
Wood, S. Casey.
Wood, W. A. P.
Woodbridge, Thos.
Woodcock, J. N.
Woodcock, W. A.
Woodhouse, C.
Woodland, C. W. I.
Woodland, Fred.
Woods, J. D.
Woods, J. W.
Woodside, J. W.
Woodsworth, J.

Worth, Arthur.
Worthington, G. R.
Wray, W. E.
Wreyford, C. D.
Wright, Alf.
Wright, E. F.
Wright, E. W.
Wylie, Norman.

Y

Yeigh, Frank.
Yeigh, Henry.
Young, A. H.
Young, C. R.
Young, H. A.
Young, L. R.
Young, M. J.
Young, W. A.
Young, W. E.
Young, Y. S.

Z

Ziegler, O. H.

F
5547
T6C33
1914/15

Canadian Club of Toronto
Addresses

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

